



931

M53

Columbia University  
in the City of New York

4

LIBRARY

















HISTORY  
OF  
LATIN CHRISTIANITY.





HISTORY  
OF  
LATIN CHRISTIANITY.



HISTORY  
OF  
LATIN CHRISTIANITY;  
INCLUDING THAT OF  
THE POPES  
TO  
THE PONTIFICATE OF NICOLAS V.

BY HENRY HART MILMAN, D.D.,  
DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S.

IN EIGHT VOLUMES.

VOLUME IV.



NEW YORK:  
SHELDON AND COMPANY.

BOSTON: GOULD AND LINCOLN.

MDCCC LXI.





HISTORY  
OF  
LATIN CHRISTIANITY;  
INCLUDING THAT OF  
THE POPES  
TO  
THE PONTIFICATE OF NICOLAS V.

By HENRY HART MILMAN, D.D.,  
DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S.

IN EIGHT VOLUMES.

VOLUME IV.



NEW YORK:  
SHELDON AND COMPANY.

BOSTON: GOULD AND LINCOLN.

M DCCCLXI.

• RIVERSIDE, CAMBRIDGE:  
STEREOTYPED AND PRINTED BY  
H. O. HOUGHTON.

# CONTENTS

## OF

### THE FOURTH VOLUME.

---

#### BOOK VII. (*continued.*)

##### CHAPTER VI.

###### THE CRUSADES.

A. D.		PAGE
	Sanctity of the Holy Land.....	15
	Pilgrimages.....	17
	Relics — Commerce.....	19
	Scheme of Gregory VII.....	24
	Peter the Hermit.....	25
1094	Council of Clermont.....	28
1094	Results of Crusades.....	32
	1. Estrangement of the East.....	38
	2. Power of the Pope.....	41
	Wealth of clergy.....	46
	3. Religious wars against Jews — Heretics — Un- believers.....	49
	4. Chivalry.....	54

---

#### BOOK VIII.

##### CHAPTER I.

###### END OF THE EMPEROR HENRY IV.

1099	Paschal II.....	67
	The Emperor resumes his power.....	70
	Peace of the Empire.....	73

•  
RIVERSIDE, CAMBRIDGE:  
STEREOTYPED AND PRINTED BY  
H. O. HOUGHTON.



# CONTENTS

## OF

### THE FOURTH VOLUME.

---

#### BOOK VII. (*continued.*)

##### CHAPTER VI.

###### THE CRUSADES.

A. D.		PAGE
	Sanctity of the Holy Land.....	15
	Pilgrimages.....	17
	Relics — Commerce.....	19
	Scheme of Gregory VII.....	24
	Peter the Hermit.....	25
1094	Council of Clermont.....	28
1094	Results of Crusades.....	32
	1. Estrangement of the East.....	38
	2. Power of the Pope.....	41
	Wealth of clergy.....	46
	3. Religious wars against Jews — Heretics — Un- believers.....	49
	4. Chivalry.....	54

---

#### BOOK VIII.

##### CHAPTER I.

###### END OF THE EMPEROR HENRY IV.

1099	Paschal II.....	67
	The Emperor resumes his power.....	70
	Peace of the Empire.....	73

A.D.		PAGE
1103	The Pope excommunicates Henry.....	75
	Unpopularity of the peace.....	77
1104	Revolt of Prince Henry.....	79
1105	Henry IV. a prisoner.....	83
1106	Death of Henry.....	86

## CHAPTER II.

## HENRY V. AND POPE PASCHAL II.

	Synod of Guastalla.....	90
1110	Diet at Ratisbon.....	93
	Henry V. in Italy — Advances on Rome.....	94
1111	Treaty.....	98
	Henry V. Emperor.....	100
	Pope refuses the coronation.....	104
	Insurrection in Rome.....	<i>ib.</i>
	Coronation of the Emperor.....	108
1112	Council in the Lateran.....	111
	Council of Vienne excommunicates the Emperor..	112
	Discontents in the Empire.....	114
1115	Death of Countess Matilda.....	116
	Archbishopric of Milan.....	117
1116	Council in the Lateran.....	<i>ib.</i>
	Henry V. in Italy.....	122
	Advances to Rome — in Rome.....	123
1118	Death of Pope Paschal.....	124
	Gelasius II. — seized by Frangipani.....	125
	Flies to Gaeta — Burdinus Antipope (Gregory VIII.) .....	127
	Gelasius II. in Rome — in France — Death.....	128

## CHAPTER III.

## CALIXTUS II.

1119	Calixtus II.....	130
	Council at Rheims.....	133
	Negotiations with the Emperor.....	135

A.D.		PAGE
	Excommunication of the Emperor.....	138
	Calixtus in Italy — The Antipope.....	139
1022	Concordat of Worms.....	144
1023	Lateran Council.....	146

## CHAPTER IV.

## ST. BERNARD — INNOCENT II.

1124	Death of Calixtus.....	149
1125	of Henry V.....	<i>ib.</i>
1124	Honorius II.....	151
1130	Contested election — Innocent II. — Anacletus II.	152
	Bernard of Clairvaux.....	155
	Molesme.....	160
	Stephen Harding — Cîteaux.....	161
	Early life of St. Bernard.....	163
	Innocent II. in France.....	167
	Acknowledged by France — England — the Empire	171
1132	The Emperor Lothair the Saxon in Italy.....	172
1139	Lateran Council.....	175
	Innocent II. prisoner of the Normans.....	178

## CHAPTER V.

## INTELLECTUAL MOVEMENT.

	Intellectual movement.....	179
	Gotschalk.....	182
	John Scotus Erigena.....	184
	Roscelin.....	190
	Anselm.....	191
	Abélard.....	196
	William of Champeaux.....	198
	Heloisa.....	200
1121	Council of Soissons.....	205
1122-5	The Paraclete.....	207
1126	St. Gildas.....	209
1140	St. Bernard — Council of Sens.....	213

A.D.		PAGE
	Condemnation of Abélard at Rome.....	218
1142	Death — Philosophy.....	220

## CHAPTER VI.

## ARNOLD OF BRESCIA.

	Arnold of Brescia — Doctrines.....	226
1132 *	In Brescia.....	229
1139	Condemned by Council of Lateran.....	236
	In Zurich — in Rome.....	<i>ib.</i>
1143	Death of Innocent II. — Cœlestine II.....	241
1144	Lucius II.....	242
	Death of Lucius.....	243
1146	Eugenius III. — Arnold in Rome.....	244
1146	Eugenius flies to France.....	247
	Bernard and William of York.....	<i>ib.</i>
	Gilbert de la Porée.....	248
	Bernard's Crusade.....	250
	The Jews — Disasters of the Crusades.....	253
	Suger, Abbot of St. Denys.....	257

## CHAPTER VII.

## HADRIAN IV. — FREDERICK BARBAROSSA.

	Hadrian IV. — Frederick Barbarossa.....	261
1152-3	Eugenius in Rome — Death.....	<i>ib.</i>
1153-4	Anastasius IV. — Hadrian IV.....	263
1155	Fall of Roman republic.....	265
	Frederick Barbarossa in Italy.....	266
	Death of Arnold of Brescia.....	269
	Romans and Barbarossa.....	271
	Frederick and Pope Hadrian — Coronation.....	272
1156	Frederick retires to Germany.....	274
	Alliance of the Pope with Sicily.....	<i>ib.</i>
1157	Diet at Besançon — Strife of the Emperor and the Pope.....	275
1158	Frederick in Italy.....	278
1159	Death of Hadrian.....	286



## CHAPTER VIII.

## ALEXANDER III. — VICTOR IV. — THOMAS À BECKET.

A. D.		PAGE
	Contested election — Alexander III. — Victor IV.	287
1160	Schism.....	291
	Alexander III. in France.....	294
1164	Death of Victor — Paschal III.....	296
	Thomas à Becket.....	<i>ib.</i>
	England — Decay of Saxon clergy.....	298
	Norman hierarchy — Lanfranc.....	299
	Anselm.....	303
	Bishops under Stephen.....	305
	Becket's birth and youth.....	311
1155-9	Becket Chancellor.....	316
1162	Becket Archbishop of Canterbury.....	323
	Gilbert Foliot.....	<i>ib.</i>
1163	Becket at Tours.....	327
	Beginning of strife.....	328
	Immunities of the clergy.....	330
	Character of Henry II.....	332
	Parliament.....	334
1164	Council of Clarendon — Constitutions.....	336
	Parliament of Northampton.....	343
	Flight of Becket.....	352
	King Louis of France.....	355
	Henry's Ambassadors at Sens.....	357
	Becket at Sens.....	358
	Becket at Pontigny.....	361
1165	Negotiations with the Emperor — Diet at Wurtz- burg.....	362
	Becket at Vezelay.....	368
1166	John of Oxford at Rome.....	373
1167	William of Pavia — Cardinal Otho — Legates....	377
	Flight of Frederick from Italy.....	<i>ib.</i>
1168	Meeting at Gisors.....	379
1169	Meeting at Montmirail.....	384
	War of France and England.....	386
	Excommunication of the Bishops by Becket.....	387

A.D.		PAGE
	Gratian and Vivian Legates.....	389
	Meeting at Montmartre.....	395
	King's Proclamation.....	397
	Commission to Archbishop of Rouen and Bishop of Nevers.....	398
	Bishops absolved.....	399
	Coronation of Prince of Wales.....	400
1170	Treaty of Fretteville.....	402
	Return of Becket to England.....	407
	Assassination.....	412
	Reconciliation of the King at Avranches.....	419
	Penance at Canterbury.....	420
	Becket a saint.....	421

## CHAPTER IX.

## ALEXANDER III. — POPES TO CLOSE OF TWELFTH CENTURY.

1165	Alexander embarks for Italy.....	427
1167	Pestilence in Frederick's army.....	430
1176	Truce of Venice.....	434
1181	Death of Alexander III.....	438
Ibid.	Pope Lucius III.....	439
1185	Pope Urban III.....	440
1187	Pope Gregory VIII.....	444
	Pope Clement III.....	445
1189	Barbarossa's crusade and death.....	447
	Pope Cœlestine III.....	<i>ib.</i>
	Coronation of the Emperor Henry.....	448
	Demolition of Tusculum.....	449
	Imprisonment of Richard I. of England.....	451
1194	The Emperor Henry in Italy.....	454
1195	Cruelties in Sicily.....	455
1196	Frederick elected King of the Romans.....	457
	Queen Constance.....	<i>ib.</i>
1197	Death of the Emperor Henry.....	458
1198	Death of Pope Cœlestine III.....	<i>ib.</i>

## BOOK IX.

## INNOCENT III.

## CHAPTER I.

## ROME AND ITALY.

A.D.		PAGE
	The Papal autocracy.....	460
	Its growth.....	<i>ib.</i>
	Effect of Crusades.....	464
	Innocent III.....	467
1160 or 1161	Birth of Innocent.....	468
	Education and connections.....	<i>ib.</i>
1190	Cardinalate.....	469
1198	Election to Papacy.....	470
	State of Christendom.....	472
1198-1202	I. The City of Rome.....	473
	Hatred of Rome and Viterbo.....	475
	Orsini and Scotti.....	477
	II. Italy.....	479
	Markwald — Conrad of Lutzenberg.....	480
1198	Queen Constantia.....	483
	Markwald before Monte Casino.....	486
1199	Markwald excommunicated.....	487
1201	Walter of Brienne.....	490
1202	Death of Markwald.....	493
	Frederick II. — his youth.....	494

## CHAPTER II.

## INNOCENT AND THE EMPIRE.

1198	Philip the Swabian, King of the Romans.....	497
<i>Ibid.</i>	Otho of Brunswick.....	<i>ib.</i>

A.D.		PAGE
1198	Conduct of Innocent.....	500
	Coronation of Philip.....	502
	Civil war.....	503
	Innocent's declaration.....	504
1199	Envoys to Rome.....	507
	War renewed.....	509
1200	Pope Innocent's Deliberation.....	510
	Activity of Innocent.....	514
1201	Coronation of Otho.....	515
	Addresses of the German Princes.....	516
1198-1208	Ten years' war.....	522
1207	Absolution of Philip.....	524
1208	Murder of Philip.....	<i>ib.</i>

## CHAPTER III.

## INNOCENT AND THE EMPEROR OTHO IV.

1209	Otho Emperor — Crowned in Rome.....	527
	Enmity between Innocent and Otho.....	528
1211	Otho excommunicated.....	530
<i>Ibid.</i>	Movements in Germany.....	531
	Overtures to Frederick.....	532
1212	Otho in Germany.....	533
	Frederick King of the Romans.....	536
1214	Battle of Bouvines.....	<i>ib.</i>

## CHAPTER IV.

## INNOCENT AND PHILIP AUGUSTUS OF FRANCE.

	Monarchy of France.....	538
1196	Marriage of Philip with Ingeburga of Denmark....	540
	Agnes of Meran.....	542
1198	Innocent's letter on the marriage of Philip Augustus.....	<i>ib.</i>



A.D.		PAGE
1199	Interdict .....	544
	Wrath of Philip Augustus.....	547
1200	Innocent inflexible.....	549
	Council of Soissons.....	553
	Death of Agnes of Meran.....	554



COLLEGE  
LIBRARY  
NEW YORK

HISTORY  
OF  
LATIN CHRISTIANITY.

---

BOOK VII. (CONTINUED.)

CHAPTER VI.

THE CRUSADES.

THIS vast subject, the Crusades, with all its causes and consequences, demands its place in the History of Latin Christianity, but must submit to be limited to an extent perhaps not quite commensurate to its importance.

The sanctity of the Holy Land, the scene of the Saviour's life and death, untraceable in the first records of the religion, had grown up, as the faith became the mistress of the whole inward nature of man, of the imagination as well as the moral sentiment, into almost a part of the general, if undefined, creed. Pilgrimage may be considered as belonging to the universal religion of man. Some sacred spots, connected either with the history of the faith or with some peculiar manifestation of the Deity, have ever concentrated the worshippers within their precincts, or drawn them together at periodical intervals to revive their pious emotions, to partake in the divine influences still supposed to be emanating from the holy ground, or to approach nearer

to the present and locally-indwelling godhead. From the lowest Fetichism up to Christianity itself this general and unconquerable propensity has either been sanctioned by the religion or sprung up out of it. Like the other more sublime and purely spiritual truths of the Gospel, the impartial ubiquity of God, the equable omnipresence of the Redeemer and the Holy Spirit throughout the whole universe and in the soul of every true believer, became too vague and unsubstantial, at least for the popular faith. It might seem an inevitable consequence of the Incarnation of the Godhead in human nature, that man should lean, as it were, more strongly on this kindred and comprehensible Saviour than on the same Saviour when retired into his remoter divinity. Everything which approximated the human Saviour to the heart and understanding was cherished with deep reverence. Even in the coldest and most unimaginative times the traveller to the Holy Land seems to enjoy a privilege enviable to the Christian, who, considering its natural effects on the religious emotions, will not venture to disdain the blameless at least, if not beneficial, excitement. The objective reality which arises from the actual places where the Saviour was born, lived, rose from the grave, ascended into heaven, works back upon the inward or subjective faith in the heart of the believer. Where the presence, the being of the Redeemer, is more intensely felt, there it is thought to dwell with greater power.

The Holy Land was very early visited by Christian pilgrims. The supposed discovery of the sacred sepulchre, with all the miraculous legend of the Emperor's vision, the disinterment of the true cross, the magnificent church built over the sepulchre by the devout He-

lena and her son Constantine, were but the consequences and manifestations of a preëxistent and dominant enthusiasm. This high example immeasurably strengthened and fed the growing passion.

It is remarkable, however, to find among those who yielded in other respects to the more materializing influences of the dominant Christianity The Fathers on Pilgrimages some who attempted to maintain on this point a lofty spirituality. Gregory of Nyssa, Augustine,<sup>1</sup> even Jerome, remonstrated against the dangerous and unnecessary journey to such remote lands ; dangerous to the virtue especially of the female sex, unnecessary to him who might worship God with equal fervor in every region. Others of the Fathers during the fourth century strongly opposed the more sublime tenet of the divine omnipresence to the sanctity of peculiar places ; the superiority of a quiet holy life in any part of the world, to the wandering over sea and land, east or west, to seek more intimate assurance of the divine presence.

Jerome, as is not unusual with him, is vehement on both sides of the question. While he himself was revelling, as it were, in all the luxury of this religious excitement, and, by his example, drawing multitudes, especially the noble females of Rome, who followed his steps and would not be divided from the object of their pious friendship, to the Holy Land ; at the same time he dissuades his friend Paulinus from the voyage, declares that heaven is equally accessible from Britain

<sup>1</sup> Compare the celebrated letter of Gregory of Nyssa. Dominus non dixit, vade in Orientem, et quære justitiam ; naviga usque ad Occidentem, ut accipias indulgentiam. — Augustin. Sermo. de Martyr. Verb. Noli longa itinera meditari : ubi credis, ubi (ibi) venis : ad eum enim qui ubique est, amando venit non navigando. — Serm. i. de Verb. Apost. Petri.

as from Palestine,<sup>1</sup> and laments with a kind of selfish querulousness the crowds which from all quarters throng the sacred places. His example was more powerful than his precept.

During the following centuries pilgrimage become the ruling passion of the more devout. The lives of Saints teem with accounts of their pious journeys. Itineraries were drawn up by which pilgrims might direct their way from the banks of the Rhine to Jerusalem. It was a work of pious munificence to build and endow hospitals along the roads for the reception of pilgrims. These pilgrims were taken under the protection of the law; they were exempt from toll, and commended by kings to the hospitality of their subjects. Charlemagne ordered that through his whole realm they were to be supplied at least with lodging, fire, and water.<sup>2</sup> In some religious houses the statutes provided for their entertainment. In Jerusalem there were public caravansaries for their reception. Gregory the Great sent money to Jerusalem to build a splendid hospital. The pilgrim set forth amid the blessings and prayers of his kindred or community, with the simple accoutrements which announced his design — the staff, the wallet, and the scallop-shell: he returned a privileged, in some sense a sanctified, being.<sup>3</sup> Pilgrimage expiated all sin. The bathing in the Jordan was, as it were, a second baptism, and washed away all the

<sup>1</sup> De Hierosolymis et de Britannia æqualiter patet aula cœlestis. — Epist. ad Paul.

<sup>2</sup> Capitul. A.D. 802. Ut in omni regno nostro neque dives, neque pauper, peregrinis hospitia denegare audeat: id est sive peregrinis propter Deum ambulantibus per terram, sive cuilibet itineranti. Propter amorem Dei et propter salutem animæ suæ tectum et focum et aquam nemo illi deneget.

<sup>3</sup> Compare Wilken, Geschichte der Kreuzzüge, i. p. 10.



evil of the former life. The shirt which he had worn when he entered the holy city was carefully laid by as his winding-sheet, and possessed, it was supposed, the power of transporting him to heaven. Palestine was believed to be a land not merely of holy reminiscences, and hallowed not only by the acts of the Saviour, but by the remains also of many saints. Places had already, by the pious invention and belief of the monks, been set apart for every scene in the Gospels or in early Christian history — the stable in Bethlehem, the garden of Gethsemane, the height where the Ascension took place; the whole land was a land of miracle, each spot had its wonders to confirm its authenticity. From an early period the descent of the fire from heaven to kindle the lights around the holy sepulchre had been played off before the wondering worshippers. The privilege of beholding Jerusalem and the sacred places was not the only advantage of the pilgrim. There was the great emporium of relics; and the pilgrim returned bearing with him a splinter of the true cross, or some other memorial of the Saviour, of the Virgin Mother, the apostles, or some earlier saint. The prodigal demand did not in the least drain the inexhaustible supply. These relics bore a high price in the West. At a later period commercial speculation in less sacred goods mingled with the devout aspirations after the Holy Land; and the silks, jewels, spices, paper, and other products of the East, were brought home from Palestine by the pious but not unworldly merchants of Venice, Pisa, Marseilles, and even of France and Germany.

Down to the conquest of Jerusalem by Chosroes the Persian the tide of pilgrimage flowed uninterrupted



Pilgrimages  
unchecked. to the Holy Land. The victory of Heraclius and the recovery of the true Cross from the hands of the fire-worshippers reëstablished the peaceful communication ; and throughout this whole period the pilgrims had only to encounter the ordinary accidents, privations, and perils of a long journey.

Nor did the capture of Jerusalem by the Mohammedans at first break off this connection between Christendom and the birth- and burial-place of the Redeemer. To the Mohammedans Jerusalem was no indifferent possession ; it was sacred, if in a less degree than Mecca. It had been visited by their prophet ; once, according to their legend, in a mysterious and supernatural manner. The prophet had wavered between Jerusalem and Mecca as the *Kebla* of prayer for his disciples. The great religious ancestor of the Jews was also that of the Arabs ; the holy men and prophets of Israel were held in honor by the new faith ; the *Korân* admitted the supreme sanctity, though not the divinity, of Jesus. On the surrender of Jerusalem to the Caliph Omar, Christianity was allowed to perform all its rites though shorn of their pomp and publicity.<sup>1</sup> Their bells might no longer peal over the city ; their processions were forbidden ; they were to allow without resistance the conversion of Christians to Islamism ; to keep themselves distinct by name, dress, and language ; to pay tribute, and to acknowledge the sovereign power of the Caliph. They were constrained to behold the mosque of Omar usurp the site of the ancient Temple of Jerusalem. Yet pilgrimage was not as the worship of images to those stern Iconoclasts. It was a part of

<sup>1</sup> They might not speak Arabic, the holy language. Compare vol. ii. page 159.

religion so common with their own belief, that they were rather disposed to respect than to despise this mark of attachment in the Christians to their own prophet. The pious therefore soon began to flock again in undiminished numbers to Mohammedan as to Christian Jerusalem.

In the plan of his great Christian Empire Charlemagne threw the shadow of his protection over the Christians in the remotest parts of the world. Not merely did he assist the churches in Syria with large alms, he entered into treaties for their protection with the Mohammedan rulers. In his amicable intercourse with Haroun Al-Raschid, the courteous Caliph bestowed on him no gift more precious than the keys of the holy sepulchre. At the great millennial period, the close of the tenth and the commencement of the eleventh century, the strong religious movement, which arose from the expectation of the Lord's coming to judgment, wrought with no less intensity on the pilgrimages to the Holy Land than on the other religious services. Men crowded to Jerusalem, as to the scene of the Lord's revelation in glory, to be witnesses of the great assize in the valley of Jehoshaphat. They were eager not merely to visit, but, if their death anticipated the last day, to die in the Holy Land.

The wars which followed the fall of the Caliphate had towards this time made Syria less secure; more than once it had been the field of battle to contending parties; and in the year 1010 there was a fierce persecution of the Christians by Hakim, the fanatic Sultan of Egypt. The Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and other Christian buildings in Jerusalem and the neighborhood, were razed to the ground.

Increasing  
danger of  
pilgrimages.

The persecution of the Christians in Palestine led to a furious persecution of the Jews in France. Rumors spread abroad that the Jews of Orleans had sent intelligence to Sultan Hakim of a meditated invasion of the Holy Land by the Christians ; and this had stirred up his slumbering fanaticism. It was an awful omen to the Jews, probably had some effect in producing those more terrible calamities which awaited them at the commencement of the actual Crusades. Hakim, however, himself repented or grew weary of the persecution, or perhaps dreaded the vengeance of the maritime powers of Italy, now becoming formidable to all the coasts of the Mediterranean. The pilgrims were permitted to resume their interrupted devotions ; they had no great peril to encounter and no degrading indignity to undergo, except the payment of a toll on the entrance to Jerusalem, established soon after this time by the Mohammedan rulers. This might sometimes be a grievous affliction to the poorer pilgrims, but it gave an opportunity for the more wealthy to display their pious munificence by defraying the cost of their admission.

Throughout the earlier half of the century men of all ranks, princes like Robert of Normandy, lordly bishops like those of Germany, headed pilgrimages. Humble monks and even peasants found their way to the Holy Land, and returned to awaken the spirit of religious adventure by the account of their difficulties and perils — the passionate enthusiasm by the wonders of the Holy Land.

Now, however, the splendid, polished, and more tolerant Mohammedanism of the earlier Caliphs had sunk before the savage yet no less warlike Turks. This

race, of the Mongol stock, had embraced all that was enterprising, barbarous, and aggressive, rejecting all that was humane or tending to a higher civilization in Mohammedanism. They were more fanatic Islamites than the followers of the Prophet, than the Prophet himself. The Seljukians became masters of Jerusalem, and from that time the Christians of Palestine, from tributary subjects became despised slaves; the pilgrims, from respected guests, intruders whose hateful presence polluted the atmosphere of pure Islamism. But neither the tyranny nor the outrages perpetrated by these new lords of Jerusalem arrested the unexhausted passion for pilgrimage, which became to some even a more praiseworthy and noble act of devotion from its perils.<sup>1</sup> The pilgrim might become a martyr. Year after year came back the few survivors of a long train of pilgrims, no longer radiant with pious pride at the accomplishment of their holy purpose, rich in precious relics or even the more costly treasures of the East; but stealing home, famished, wounded, mutilated, with lamentable tales of their own sufferings and of those who had died of the ill-usage of the barbarous unbelievers.

At length the afflictions of the Christians found a voice which woke indignant Europe — an apostle who could rouse warlike Latin Christendom to encounter with equal fanaticism this new outburst of the fanaticism of Islam. This was the mission of the hermit Peter.

<sup>1</sup> Lambert the historian performed a furtive pilgrimage. He was much alarmed lest his abbot (of Hertzfeld), without whose permission he set forth, should die without having forgiven him. He speaks of having incurred extreme peril, and of having returned to his monastery, quasi ex impiis redivivus. We should have been glad to have heard his own perils described by so powerful a writer. — Sub ann. 1059.

Latin Christendom was already in some degree prepared for this great confederacy. A league of the whole Christian world against the Mohammedans had expanded before Gerbert, Silvester II. The Cæsar of the West, his master Otho III., was to add at least Palestine to the great Christian realm.<sup>1</sup> It was among the bold visions which had floated before the imagination of Gregory VII.<sup>2</sup> His strong sagacity, aided no doubt by good intelligence, had discerned the revolution in the spirit of Mohammedanism from the Turkish superiority. Hildebrand's more immediate object, however, was not the recovery of the Holy Land, but the defence of the Greek Empire, which was now threatened by the advance of the irresistible Seljukians into Asia Minor. The repression of Mohammedanism on all sides, in Italy especially, where it had more than once menaced Rome itself, conspired with the one paramount object of Hildebrand, the subjugation of Christendom to the See of Rome, and the unity of the Church under the supremacy of the Pope, to whom all temporal powers were to own their subordination. The Greek Empire was to render its allegiance to the Pontiff as the price of its protection from the Turks; it was to become an integral and essential part of the spiritual Empire. Gregory had intimated his design of placing himself at the head of this Crusade, which was at once to consolidate and secure from foreign and infidel aggression the ecclesiastical monarchy of the West. But the deliverance of the decrepit, unrespected, and often hostile Empire of the East would have awakened no powerful movement in

<sup>1</sup> Gerbert's letter in the name of Jerusalem. In Murat. R. I. S. iii. 400.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Gregory's Regesta, i. 30, i. 49, ii. 31.



Latin Christendom: the fall of Constantinople would have startled too late the tardy fears and sympathies of the West. The ambassadors of Alexius Comnenus at Piacenza were received with decent respect, but with no passionate impulse. The letters from the East, imploring aid, had no power to hush and suspend the hostilities which distracted the West. If not heard with indifference, they left but superficial and evanescent impressions on the minds even of those who had most reason to dread the progress of the Mohammedan arms.

For the conquest of the Holy Land a zealous Pope might alone in favorable times have raised a great Christian army; he might have enlisted numbers of warlike and adventurous nobles, even sovereigns, in the cause. But humbler and more active instruments were wanting for a popular and general insurrection in favor of the oppressed and afflicted pilgrims, for the restoration of the Holy Land to the dominion of the Cross. All great convulsions of society are from below.

Peter the Hermit is supposed, but only supposed, to have been of gentle birth. He was of igno-  
ble stature, but with a quick and flashing eye; Peter the Hermit.  
his spare, sharp person seemed instinct with the fire which worked within his restless soul. He was a Frank (of Amiens in Picardy), and therefore spoke most familiarly the language of that people, ever ready for adventurous warfare, especially warfare in the cause of religion. Peter had exhausted, without satisfying the cravings of his religious zeal, all the ordinary excitements, the studies, the austerities and mortifications, the fasts and prayers of a devout life. Still yearning for more powerful emotions, he had retired into the

solitude of the strictest and severest cloister. There his undoubting faith beheld in the visions of his disturbed and inthrall'd imagination revelations from heaven. In those days such a man could not but undertake a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, more especially in times when martyrdom might be his reward. The deeper his feelings at visiting the holy places, the more strong would be his sorrow and indignation at their desecration by their rude and cruel masters. Peter saw with a bleeding heart the sufferings and degradation of his brethren; his blood turned to fire; the martial Frank was not extinct within him. In an interview with Simeon, the persecuted patriarch, he ventured to rebuke his despondency. When Simeon deplored the hopeless weakness of the Byzantine Empire, the natural lords and protectors of the Christians in Syria, Peter fearlessly promised him the succor of Western Christendom. His vow seemed to obtain the ratification of God. Prostrate in the temple he heard, as it were, the voice of our Lord himself, "Rise, Peter, go forth to make known the tribulations of my people; the hour is come for the delivery of my servants, for the recovery of the holy places!"

Peter fully believed in his own mission, and was A.D. 1094. therefore believed by others. He landed in Italy, he hastened to Rome. The Pope, Urban, was kindled by his fervor, acknowledged him as a Prophet, and gave full sanction to his announcement of the immediate deliverance of Jerusalem.

The Hermit traversed Italy, crossed the Alps, with indefatigable restlessness went from province to province, from city to city. His appearance commanded attention, his austerity respect, his language instant-



neous and vehement sympathy. He rode on a mule, with a crucifix in his hand, his head and feet bare ; his dress was a long robe girt with a cord, and a hermit's cloak of the coarsest stuff. He preached in the pulpits, in the roads, in the market-places. His eloquence was that which stirs the heart of the people, for it came from his own, brief, figurative, full of bold apostrophes ; it was mingled with his own tears, with his own groans ; he beat his breast ; the contagion spread throughout his audience. His preaching appealed to every passion, to valor and shame, to indignation and pity, to the pride of the warrior, the compassion of the man, the religion of the Christian, to the love of the Brethren, to the hatred of the Unbeliever, aggravated by his insulting tyranny, to reverence for the Redeemer and the Saints, to the desire of expiating sin, to the hope of eternal life. Sometimes he found persons who, like himself, had visited the Holy Land ; he brought them forth before the people, and made them bear witness to what they had seen or what they had suffered. He appealed to them as having beheld Christian blood poured out wantonly as water, the foulest indignities perpetrated on the sacred places in Jerusalem. He invoked the Holy Angels, the Saints in Heaven, the Mother of God, the Lord himself, to bear witness to his truth. He called on the holy places — on Sion, on Calvary, on the Holy Sepulchre, to lift up their voices and implore their deliverance from sacrilegious profanation : he held up the Crucifix, as if Christ himself were exploring their succor.

His influence was extraordinary, even beyond the immediate object of his mission. Old enemies came to be reconciled ; the worldliest to forswear the world ; pre-

ates to entreat the hermit's intercession. Gifts showered upon him; he gave them all to the poor, or as dowries for loose women, whom he provided with husbands. His wonders were repeated from mouth to mouth; all ages, both sexes, crowded to touch his garments; the very hairs which dropped from his mule were caught and treasured as relics.

Western Christendom, particularly France, was thus prepared for the outburst of militant religion. Council of Clermont. Nothing was wanted but a plan, leaders, and organization. Such was the state of things when Pope Urban presented himself to the Council of Clermont, in Auvergne.

Where all the motives which stir the mind and heart, the most impulsive passion, and the profoundest policy, conspire together, it is impossible to discover which has the dominant influence in guiding to a certain course of action. Urban, no doubt, with his strong religiousness of character, was not superior to the enthusiasm of his times; to him the Crusade was the cause of God. This is manifest from the earnest simplicity of his memorable speech in the Council. No one not fully possessed by the frenzy could have communicated it. At the same time, no event (to this his discerning mind could not be blind) could be more favorable, or more opportune for the advancement of the great Papal object of ambition, the acknowledged supremacy over Latin Christendom; or for the elevation of Urban himself over the rival Pope and the temporal Sovereigns his enemies. Placing himself at the head of this vast popular movement, he left his rival at an immeasurable distance below him in general reverence. He rose to no less a height over the temporal Sovereigns.

The author of the Crusades was too holy a person, too manifest a vicegerent of Christ himself, for men either to question his title or circumscribe his authority. Thus the excommunication of the King of France, like the earthquake during the victory of Hannibal at Thrasymene, passed almost without notice.

Never, perhaps, did a single speech of man work such extraordinary and lasting results as that <sup>Speech of</sup> of Urban II. at the Council of Clermont. <sup>Urban II.</sup>

Urban, as a native of France, spoke, no doubt, the language of the country;<sup>1</sup> his speech has survived only in the colder and more stately ecclesiastical Latin; and probably has preserved but few of those pathetic and harrowing details of the cruelty, the licentiousness, the sacrilege of the Turks, which told most effectively on his shuddering and maddening audience.<sup>2</sup> He dwelt on the sanctity, on the wonders of the land of promise; the land chosen of God, to whom all the earth belonged as his own inheritance; the land of which the history had been recorded both in the Old and New Testament; of this land the foul Infidels were now the lords — of the Holy City itself, hal-  
lowed by the Life and Death of the Saviour. Whose soul melted not within; whose bowels were not stirred with shame and sorrow? The Holy Temple had become not only a den of thieves, but the dwelling-place of Devils. The churches, even that of the Holy Sep-

<sup>1</sup> Certatim currunt Christi purgare sepulchrum  
Francigenus cunctus populus, de quo fuit ortus  
Urbanus Pastor. DONIZO.

<sup>2</sup> There are three copies of Urban's speech, unless they are, as is most probable, different speeches delivered on different occasions: one in William of Tyre, one in William of Malmesbury, one printed from a MS. in the Vatican in the Concilia.

ulchre itself, had become stalls for cattle, and Christian men were massacred and Christian women ravished within the holy precincts. The Heavenly fire had ceased to descend; the Lord would not visit his defiled sanctuary. While Christians were shedding Christian blood, they were sinfully abandoning this sacred field for their valor, and yielding up their brethren in Christ to the yoke, to the sword of the Unbeliever: they were warring on each other, when they ought to be soldiers of Christ. He assured them that the Saviour himself, the God of armies, would be their leader and their guide in battle. There was no passion which he left unstirred. "The wealth of your enemies shall be yours; ye shall plunder their treasures. Ye serve a commander who will not permit his soldiers to want bread, or a just reward for their services.<sup>1</sup> He offered absolution for all sins (there was no crime — murder, adultery, robbery, arson — which might not be redeemed by this act of obedience to God); absolution without penance to all who would take up arms in this sacred cause. It was better to fall in battle than not to march to the aid of the Brethren; he promised eternal life to all who should suffer the glorious calamity of death in the Holy Land, or even in the way to it. The Crusader passed at once into Paradise. For himself, he must remain aloof; but, like a second Moses, while they were slaughtering the Amalekites, he would be perpetually engaged in fervent and prevailing prayer for their success."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Facultates etiam inimicorum nostrorum vestræ erunt; quoniam et illorum thesauros expoliabitis. . . . Tali Imperatori militare debetis cui panis deesse non potest, cui quæ rependat, nulla desint stipendia.* This is from the Vatican speech. I have taken the liberty of compiling from all three.

<sup>2</sup> This likewise is from the Vatican speech.

The Pontiff could scarcely conclude his speech ; he was interrupted by ill-suppressed murmurs of grief and indignation. At its close, one loud <sup>Crusade</sup> and simultaneous cry broke forth : “ It is the will of God ! it is the will of God ! ” All ranks, all classes, were seized with the contagious passion ; the assembly declared itself the army of God. Not content with his immediate success, the Pope enjoined on all the Bishops to preach instantly, unremittingly, in every diocese, the imperative duty of taking up arms to redeem the Holy Sepulchre. The epidemic madness spread with a rapidity inconceivable, except from the knowledge how fully the mind and heart of man were prepared to imbibe the infection. France, including both its Frank and Norman population, took the lead ; Germany, of colder temperament and distracted by its own civil contentions, the Imperialist faction from hatred of the Pope, moved more tardily and reluctantly ; in Italy it was chiefly the adventurous Normans who crowded to the war ; in England the Normans were too much occupied in securing their vast possessions, the Anglo-Saxon population too much depressed, to send large numbers of soldiers. All Europe, however, including the Northern nations, except Spain, occupied with her own crusade in her own realm, sent their contingent, either to the wild multitudes who swarmed forth under Walter the Pennyless, or the more regular army under Godfrey of Boulogne. The Crusade was no national war of Italy, France, or Germany against the Egyptian Empire of the Fatimites, or the Seljukian Sultan of Iconium : it was a war of Christendom against Mohammedanism. No government hired the soldiers, unless so far as the feudal chief summoned his



vassals to accompany him ; nor provided transports and the artillery and implements of war, or organized a commissariat, or nominated to the chief command. Each was a volunteer, and brought his own horse, arms, accoutrements, provisions. In the first disastrous expeditions, under Peter the Hermit and Walter the Pennyless, the leaders were designated by popular acclamation or by bold and confident self-election. The general deference and respect for his admirable character and qualifications invested Godfrey of Boulogne in the command of the first regular army. It was fortunate, perhaps, that none of the great Sovereigns of Europe joined the first Crusade ; the Emperor and the King of France were under excommunication ; Conrad, King of Italy, too necessary to the Pope to be spared from Italy ; in William Rufus was wanting the great impulse, religious faith. The ill success of the later Crusades, undertaken by Emperors and Kings, their frequent want of ability for supreme command when alone, their jealousies when allied, show that a league of princes of the second rank, though not without their intrigues and separate interests, was better suited for this kind of expedition.

The results of these wars, rather than the wars themselves, must find their place in the history of Christianity. Urban II. lived to hear hardly more than the disasters and miseries of his own work. His faith had the severe trial of receiving the sad intelligence of the total destruction of the myriads who marched into Hungary and perished on the way, by what was unjustly considered the cruelty of the Hungarians and treachery of the Greeks ; scarcely one of these ever reached the borders of

Results of  
Crusades.

the Holy Land. His depression may have been allayed by the successes of the army under Godfrey of Boulogne: he heard of the capture of Antioch, but died before the tidings of the fall of Jerusalem on the 15th of July, 1099, could reach Rome.

The Crusades — contemplated not with cold and indifferent philosophy, but with that lofty spiritualism of faith which cannot consent to limit Causes of Crusades. the ubiquitous God, and Saviour, and Holy Spirit to any place, or to any peculiar mountain or city, and to which a war of religion is essentially, irreconcilably oppugnant to the spirit of Christianity — may seem the height of human folly. The Crusades, if we could calculate the incalculable waste of human life from first to last (a waste without achieving any enduring result,) and all the human misery which is implied in that loss of life, may seem the most wonderful frenzy which ever possessed mankind. But from a less ideal point of view — a view of human affairs as they have actually evolved under the laws or guidance of Divine Providence — considerations suggest themselves which mitigate or altogether avert this contemptuous or condemnatory sentence. If Christianity, which was to mould and fuse the barbarous nations into one great European society — if Latin Christianity and the political system of the West were to be one in limits and extent, it was compelled to assume this less spiritual, more materialistic form. Reverence for holy places — that intense passion which first showed itself in pilgrimages, afterwards in the Crusade — was an inseparable part of what has been called mediæval Christianity. Nor was this age less inevitably an age of war — an age in which human life, even if it had not been



thrown away on so vast a scale on one object, would hardly have escaped other (probably hardly less extensive) destruction. It would be bold to say how much the Crusades, at such a time, enhanced the mass of human suffering. Those who strewed the plains of Hungary or of Asia Minor with their bones — who for above a century watered the soil of Palestine with their blood — would probably have fallen in great numbers in nearer and more intestine wars; wars waged for a less generous and unselfish end. The Crusades consummated, and the Christian Church solemnly blessed and ratified, the unnatural it might be, but perhaps necessary and inevitable, union between Christianity and the Teutonic military spirit. Yet what but Christian warlike fanaticism could cope with the warlike Mohammedan fanaticism which had now revived by the invasion of the Turks, a race more rude and habitually predatory and conquering than the Arabs of the Prophet, and apparently more incapable of yielding to those genial influences of civilization which had gradually softened down the Caliphs of Damascus, Bagdad, Cairo, and Cordova, to splendid and peaceful monarchs? Few minds were, perhaps, far-seeing enough to contemplate the Crusades, as they have been viewed by modern history, as a blow struck at the heart of the Mohammedan power; as a politic diversion of the tide of war from the frontiers of the European kingdoms to Asia. Yet neither can this removal of the war to a more remote battle-field, nor the establishment of the principle that all Christian powers were natural allies against Mohammedan powers (though this principle, at a later period, gave way before European animosities and enmities), have been without important influence on the course of human affairs.

To this union of the military spirit of Europe and of Christianity each brought its dowry — the military spirit its unmitigated ferocity, its Alliance of religious and military spirit. wild love of adventure, its licentiousness, its contempt for human life, at times its generosity, and here and there touches of that chivalrous respect for females which had belonged to the Teutonic races, and was now mingled up with the religion. Christianity was content to bring its devotional without any of its humanizing influences, its fervent faith, which was assured of its everlasting reward, its strict obedience to all the outward ceremonial of religion, its earnest prayers, its profound humility. But it left out all restraining discipline of the violent and revengeful passions; it checked not the fury of conquest; allayed in no way the miseries of the strife. The knight, before the battle, was as devout as the bishop; the bishop, in the battle, no less ferocious than the knight. No one denied himself the full privilege of massacre or of plunder; it was rather a duty against unbelievers: the females of a conquered town had no better fate with a crusading, than with a Mohammedan soldiery.

The Crusades have been called, and justly, the heroic age of Christianity — the heroic age in Heroic age of Christianity. the ordinary, not the Christian sense, that of the Gospel — which would seek her own heroes rather among the martyrs and among the benefactors of mankind. It had all the violence, the rudeness, but also the grandeur, the valor, daring, endurance, self-sacrifice, wonderful achievements, the development of strength, even of craft, which belongs to such a period: the wisdom of Godfrey of Boulogne, the gallantry of Tancred of Hauteville, the subtlety of

Raimond of Toulouse; in later times the rivalry of the more barbarous Richard of England with the more courteous and polished Saladin. But in no point are the Crusades more analogous to the heroic ages of other times than in the elevation of the heroes of the war above the common herd of the soldiery.<sup>1</sup> In all wars the glory of the few is bought by the misery of the many. The superior armor and weapons, the fighting on horseback, as well as the greater skill in managing the weapons and the horse, no doubt the calmer courage, maintained the nobles as a martial and feudal aristocracy, who obtained all the glory and the advantages of their transient successes. Never, perhaps, were expeditions so utterly, hopelessly disastrous, so wildly prodigal of human life, as the *popular* Crusade, which set off first under Peter the Hermit. Of all this the blind enthusiasm of that day took as little notice as in later times did Godfrey's Frank knights in their poetic admiration of his exploits. In the fame of Godfrey's conquest of Jerusalem, in the establishment of that kingdom, no one under the rank of knight acquired honor, power, emolument. But since, in the account

<sup>1</sup> The Crusades ought to have been the heroic age of Christianity in poetry; but their Homer arose too late. At the time of the Crusades there was wanting a common language, or indeed any language already formed and approaching to the life and energy of the Homeric Greek; at the same time sufficiently vernacular and popular not to become antiquated in the course of time. Before the polite and gentle Tasso, even the Italian had lost the rudeness and picturesque simplicity of its Dantesque form: the religious enthusiasm had been subdued to a timorous orthodoxy, which trembled before the Inquisition; the martial spirit was that of the earlier romantic poems rather than the Crusader's fanatic love of battle and hatred of the Unbeliever. With all its exquisite and pathetic passages the "Jerusalem Delivered" is no Crusader's epic. Beautiful as a work of art, it is still a work of art. It is suited to the court of Ferrara rather than to the castle-hall of a chieftain returned after years of war from the Holy Land.

of the Crusades, even more than in other parts of the Christian annals, the life, the reality, the character, even the terror and beauty, the poetry of the whole period, consists in the details, it is only in the acts and words of individuals that clearly transpire the workings of the religion of the times. The History of Christianity must leave those annals, as a separate province, and content itself with following out some of the more general results of those extraordinary and characteristic events. I will only relate two incidents: one illustrative of the frightfulness of this Holy War; one of the profound religion which, nevertheless, lay in the hearts of its leaders.

No barbarian, no infidel, no Saracen, ever perpetrated such wanton and cold-blooded atrocities <sup>Incidents of the</sup> of cruelty as the wearers of the Cross of <sup>Crusades.</sup> Christ (who, it is said, had fallen on their knees and burst into a pious hymn at the first view of the Holy City), on the capture of that city. Murder was mercy, rape tenderness, simple plunder the mere assertion of the conqueror's right. Children were seized by their legs, some of them plucked from their mothers' breasts and dashed against the walls, or whirled from the battlements. Others were obliged to leap from the walls; some tortured, roasted by slow fires. They ripped up prisoners to see if they had swallowed gold. Of 70,000 Saracens there were not left enough to bury the dead; poor Christians were hired to perform the office. Every one surprised in the Temple was slaughtered, till the reek from the dead bodies drove away the slayers. The Jews were burned alive in their synagogue. Even the day after, all who had taken refuge on the roofs, notwithstanding Tancred's

resistance, were hewn to pieces. Still later the few Saracens who had escaped (not excepting babes of a year old) were put to death to avenge the insults to the dead, and lest they should swell the numbers of the advancing Egyptian army. The ghost of Bishop Adhemar de Puy, the Legate, (he had died of the plague at Antioch) was seen in his sacerdotal habits partaking in the triumph, and it appears, not arresting the carnage.<sup>2</sup>

Yet when Godfrey was unanimously saluted as sovereign of the conquered realm, to the universal admiration, he refused to be king: he would only be administrator, where the Saviour had been called a servant; he would wear no golden crown where the Redeemer had worn a crown of thorns.<sup>2</sup>

Return we to the effects of the expeditions to the Holy Land.

I. The first and more immediate result of the Crusades was directly the opposite to that which had been promised, and no doubt expected, by the advisers of these expeditions. Though not the primary, the security of the Eastern Christian Empire, and its consequent closer alliance with Latin Christendom, was at least a secondary object. Latin and Greek Christendom would become, if not one Empire, one indissoluble league: the Greek Church would become part of the kingdom of St. Peter. But instead of the

Estrangement of the East.

<sup>1</sup> Mulieres mucrone perfoderunt, infantes adhuc sugentes per plantam pedis e sinu matris aut cunabulis arreptos muris vel ostiorum liminibus allidentes fractis cervicibus, alios armis trucidarunt. — Albert. Aquens. p. 281. Alii illorum quos levius erat captibus obtruncabantur; alii autem sagittati de turribus saltare cogebantur, alii vero diutissime torti et ignibus adusti. — Hist. B. Sacri, p. 179. Compare the later historians of the Crusades, Wilken, Michaud, i. 411; Von Raumer (Hohenstaufen), i. 216.

<sup>2</sup> All the later authorities.



reconciliation of the Byzantine Empire with the West, the Crusade led to a more total estrangement; instead of blending the Churches into one, the hostility became more strong and obstinate. The Emperors of the East found their friends not less dangerous and destructive than their enemies could have been. Vast hordes of disorderly and undisciplined fanatics came swarming across the frontiers, trampling down everything in their way, and spreading desolation through the more peaceful and flourishing provinces. Already the Hungarians had taken up arms against these unwelcome strangers; and a Christian power had been the first to encounter the champions of the Cross. The leaders of the Crusade, the Hermit himself, and a soldier of fortune, Walter, who went by the name of the Pennyless, were altogether without authority, and had taken no steps to organize or to provide food for this immense population which they had set in motion. This army mainly consisted of the poorer classes, whose arms, such as they were, were their only possession. The more enthusiastic, no doubt, vaguely trusted to the protection of Providence; God would not allow the soldiers of his blessed Son to perish with want. The more thoughtful calculated on the hospitality of their Christian brethren. The pilgrims of old had found hospitals and caravansaries established for their reception; they had been fed by the inexhaustible bounty of the devout. But it had occurred to none that, however friendly, the inhabitants of Hungary and the Provinces of the Byzantine Empire, through which they passed, could not, without miracles, feed the swelling, and it seemed, never-ending swarm of strangers. Hunger led to plunder, plunder

to hostility, hostility hardened and inflamed to the most bitter mutual antipathy. Europe rung with denunciations of the inhospitality, the barbarity of these more than unbelievers, who were accused of secret intelligence and confederacy with the Mohammedans against the cause of Christ. The subtle policy of Alexius Comnenus, whose craft was in some degree successful in the endeavor to rid his subjects of this intolerable burden, was branded as the most malignant treachery. Hence mistrust, hatred, contempt, sprang up between the Greek and Latin Christians, which centuries could hardly have eradicated, even if they had been centuries of friendly intercourse rather than of aggravated wrong and unmingling hostility. The Greeks despised the Franks as rude and savage robbers; the Franks disdained the Greeks as wily and supple slaves.

The conduct of the more regular army, which took another and less destructive course, was restrained by some discipline, and maintained at first some courtesy, yet widened rather than closed this irreparable breach. The Emperor of the East found that his Western allies conquered not for him, but for themselves. Instead of considering Syria and Palestine as parts of the Eastern Empire, they created their own independent principalities, and owned no sovereignty in him who claimed to be the legitimate lord of those territories. There was a singular sort of feudal title made out to Palestine: God was the Sovereign owner; through the Virgin, of royal descent from the house of David, it descended to our Lord. At a later period the contempt of the Franks reached its height in their conquest of Constantinople, and the establishment of a Latin dynasty on the throne of the Eastern Emperors; contempt which



was amply repaid by the hatred of the Greeks, who, when they recovered the Empire, were only driven by hard necessity to cultivate any friendly alliance with the West.

This implacable temporal hostility did not tend to soften or reconcile the religious difference. The supremacy of the Pope became a sign, a bitter remembrancer of their subjugation. Even at the last hour, after the Council of Florence, the Eastern Church refused to surrender its freedom or to accept the creed of the West.

II. The Pope, the clergy, the monastic institutions, derived a vast accession of power, influence, and wealth from the Crusades. Already Ur-<sup>Power of the Pope.</sup>ban, by placing himself at the head of the great movement, had enshrined himself in the general reverence, and to the Pope reverence was power and riches.<sup>1</sup> He had crushed his adversaries in the popular mind of great part of Christendom. He bequeathed this great legacy of preëminence to his successors. The Pope was general-in-chief of the armies of the faith. He assumed from the commencement, and maintained to the end of the Crusades, an enormous dispensing authority, to which no one ventured or was disposed to raise any objection; not a dispensing authority only from the penalties of sin in this world or the next, a mitigation of the pains of purgatory, or a remittal of those acts of penance which the Church commuted at her will: the taking the cross absolved, by his author-

<sup>1</sup> Compare Heeren's Essay on the influence of the Crusades, Werke, vol. ii., and Choiseul d'Aillecourt, who obtained the second prize from the French Academy. To these writers I would refer for the general effects on commerce, arts, and literature.

ity, from all temporal, civil, and social obligation. It substituted a new and permanent principle of obedience for feudal subordination. The Pope became the liege lord of mankind. His power commanded, though unhappily it could not enforce, a truce from all other wars throughout Christendom. The theory was the universal amicable alliance of all Christians against the common foe, the unbeliever: war therefore of Christian against Christian became treason against the sacred cause. The prince who took the cross left his dominions under the protection of the Holy See; but as the more ambitious, rapacious, and irreligious of the neighboring sovereigns were those who remained behind, this security was extremely precarious. But the noble became really exempt from most feudal claims; he could not be summoned to the banner of his Lord: even the bonds of the villein, the serf, and the slave were broken or enfeebled; they were free, if they could extricate themselves from a power which, in the eye of the Church, as interfering with the discharge of a higher duty, was lawless, to follow the cross.<sup>1</sup> Even the creditor could not arrest the debtor. The Crusader was the soldier of the Church, and this was his first allegiance which released him from all other. The Pope was thus invested in a kind of supremacy altogether new and unprecedented.

But though the acknowledged head and leader in

<sup>1</sup> Men were allowed to commute base or even capital punishments for perpetual exile to the Holy Land. James de Vitry complains bitterly of the degradation of the honor of the Crusades, and other evil consequences of this doctrine. *Viri sanguinum et filii mortis in patriâ suâ deprehensi in iniquitatibus et maleficiis suis, mutilationibus membrorum vel suspendio adjudicati, prece vel pretio plerumque obtinebant, ut in terram promissionis sine spe revertendi, perpetuo condemnati exilio, remanerent. Hi autem non penitentiâ compuniti, &c.* — *Hist. Orient.* i. 82.

this universal league, no Pope was so rash or so adventurous as to commit himself to the actual perils of an expedition to the Holy Land. No Pope a Crusader.

Some pontiffs professed their intention, some made preparations to place themselves at the head of a crusading army. But from prudence or timidity, from circumstances or from design, Christendom was spared what might have been almost the fatal humiliation of defeat and disaster, the seeming abandonment by God of his vicar upon earth, the desecration, it might be, of his person by the hands of barbarous unbelievers, his captivity in a foreign land — fiery trials which might end in glorious martyrdom, but if not in martyrdom, might it not be in weakness? dare it be supposed in apostasy? No devout mind could contemplate the possibility, under the most awful ordeal ever encountered by flesh and blood, of a renegade Pope; still it might be well that even the remotest peril of such an appalling event should be avoided. He was spared, too, from being an eye-witness of the indescribable calamities, the bootless carnage, the sufferings from plague and famine, as well as from the enemy, by which the Crusades were distinguished from almost all other wars; and the more unseemly spectacle of the crimes, the cruelties, the unbridled licentiousness, the strife, and jealousies, and treacheries, which prevailed too often in the Christian camp, and would hardly have been overawed by his presence. The Pope, however, though not personally mingled up in this humiliating it might be, no doubt almost inevitably disenchanting and too frequently debasing intercourse with the wild soldiery, was present by his Legate. Adhemar, Bishop of Puy, was the representative of the Pope in the first Crusade; and

so, although the temporal princes assumed the right of election to the kingdom of Jerusalem, yet he was there to assert the right of ecclesiastical interference in the direction of a war waged for religious ends and under religious sanction.

But the hold on the human mind, which directly or indirectly accrued to the Pope in Europe from this right of levying war throughout Christendom against the unbeliever, of summoning, or at least enlisting, all mankind under the banner of the cross, could not but increase in its growth as long as the crusading frenzy maintained its power. The holy war was a means opened by God of atonement for sins, besides sacerdotal sanctity or devotion to the monastic life; a lower and easier kind of atonement for the vulgar, incapable of that higher religiousness. Who was beyond or above this motive?<sup>1</sup> Thus that which was at first a passion became a duty, and once recognized as a duty, it was a test by which the Pope could try the faith or the fidelity of his more contumacious spiritual subjects. To take the cross was the high price which might obtain absolution for the most enormous offence; and therefore, if the Pope so willed, he would be satisfied with nothing less. There were few sovereigns so cautious, or so superior to the dominant superstition, as not, in some period of enthusiasm or disaster, of ambition or affliction, either from the worldly desire of propitiating the favor of the Pope, or under the pangs of wounded

<sup>1</sup> Deus nostro tempore prælia sancta instituit, ut ordo equestris et vulgus oberrans, qui vetustæ Paganitatis exemplo in mutuas versabatur cædes, *novum reperirent salutis promerendæ genus*: ut nec funditus electa, ut fieri assolet monastica conversatione, seu religiosâ qualibet professione sæculum relinquere cogerentur; sed sub consuetâ licentiâ et habitu ex suo ipsorum officio Dei aliquatenus gratiam consequerentur. — Guido Abbas, p. 1076.

conscience, to entangle themselves with this irrevocable vow ; that vow at least which could only be annulled by the Pope, who was in general little disposed to relax his hold on his self-fettered subject. The inexorable taskmaster, to whom the king or prince had sold himself in the hour of need, either demanded the immediate service, or held the mandate in terror over his head to keep him under subjection. It will appear hereafter how the most dangerous antagonist of the papal power, the Emperor Frederick II., was trammelled in this inextricable bondage, from which he could not release himself even by fulfilling its conditions.

The legatine authority of the Pope expanded to a great extent in consequence of the Crusades.<sup>1</sup> Legatine authority of the Pope. Before this period an ecclesiastic, usually of high rank or fame, had been occasionally commissioned by the Pope to preside in local councils, to determine controversies, to investigate causes, to negotiate with sovereigns. As acting in the Pope's person, he assumed or exercised the right of superseding all ordinary jurisdiction, that of the bishops and even of the metropolitans. The Crusades gave an opportunity of sending legates into every country in Latin Christendom, in order to preach and to recruit for the Crusades, to urge the laity who did not take up the cross in person to contribute to the expenses of the war, to authorize or to exact the subsidies of the clergy. The public mind became more and more habituated to the presence, as it were, of the Pope by his representative, to the superseding of all authority in his name. The hierarchy, in such a cause, could not venture to resist the encroachment on their jurisdiction ; the exactions

<sup>1</sup> Compare Heeren, p. 147 ; Planck, ii. p. 631.



from the clergy, though still disguised under the semblance of a voluntary contribution, furnished a dangerous precedent for demands on the revenues of other churches for the use of Rome. Not only the secular clergy but the monasteries were bound to assign part of their revenues for the conquest of the Holy Land; with them, too, the free-will offering became a tax, and the principle was thus established of taxation for foreign purposes and by a superior authority.<sup>1</sup> The Pope became, to a certain degree, the absolute supreme lord, as far as the right of assessing burdens, at first for a specific object, at length for his own objects (whatever might appear so to his wisdom must be a worthy object), on the whole ecclesiastical property of Latin Christendom.

But to the clergy and to the monastic institutions the vast increase in their wealth and territorial possessions more than compensated for this, at first, light taxation. There may have been few, but doubtless there were some of all ranks up to princedoms, who in their reckless enthusiasm stripped themselves of all their goods, abandoned their lands and possessions, and reserved nothing but their sword, their horse, and a trifling sum for their maintenance, determined to seek either new possessions or a glorious and saintly grave in the Holy Land. If they had no heirs, it was a trifling sacrifice; if they had, it was a more praiseworthy and truly religious sacrifice to make over their

Wealth of the  
clergy.

<sup>1</sup> The bishops in *partibus Infidelium* had their origin in the Crusades; as the Crusaders conquered, they founded or reëstablished sees. When their conquests fell back to the Mohammedans the bishops were obliged to fly: many took refuge in Rome. These being already invested in episcopal power, they were often employed as vicars-general in different countries, a new office of great importance to the Papal power.



estates to the Church ; this consummated the merit of him who had sunk every duty and every tie in the character of champion of the cross. But all were suddenly called upon for a large expenditure, to meet which they had made no provision. The private adventurer had to purchase his arms, his Milan or Damascus steel, his means of transport and provision ; the nobles and the princes, in proportion to their rank and territory, to raise, arm, and maintain their vassals. Multitudes were thus compelled to pledge or to alienate their property. The Jews were always at hand to receive in pawn or to purchase their personal possessions. But the Jews in most parts of Europe had no concern in the cultivation of the soil, in some could not be landed proprietors. Here and there prudent nobles, or even kings, might watch this favorable opening, when estates were thrown so prodigally and abundantly on the market. So William Rufus bought his elder brother's dukedom of Normandy.

But there was one wealthy body alone which was not deeply embarked in these costly undertakings — the Church. The bishops who took up the cross might possibly burden, they could not alienate, their estates. On the other hand, the clergy and the monasteries were everywhere on the spot to avail themselves of the embarrassments and difficulties of their neighbors. It was their bounden duty to increase to the utmost that which was called the property of God ; rapacity had long been a virtue, it was thought to have lost all its selfishness when exercised in behalf of the Church. Godfrey of Boulogne alienated part of his estates to the Bishop of Verdun ; he pledged another part to the Bishop of Liege. For at least two centuries this traf-

fic went silently on, the Church always receiving, rarely alienating; and this added to the ordinary offerings of devotion, the bequests of deathbed remorse, the exactions for hard-wrung absolution, the prodigal bribes of superstitious terror, the alms of pure and self-denying charity.<sup>1</sup> Whoever during the whole period of the Crusades sought to whom he might intrust his lands as guardian, or in perpetuity if he should find his grave or richer possessions in the Holy Land, turned to the Church, by whose prayers he might win success, by whose masses the sin which clung to the soul even of the soldier of the cross might be purged away. If he returned, he returned often a disappointed and melancholy man, took refuge from his despondent religious feelings in the cloister, and made over his remaining rights to his brethren. If he returned no more, the Church was in possession. The churchman who went to the Holy Land did not hold in himself the perpetual succession to the lands of his see or of his monastery; it was in the Church or in the fraternity.<sup>2</sup> Thus in every way the all-absorbing Church was still gathering in wealth, encircling new lands within her hallowed pale, the one steady merchant who in this vast traffic and sale of personal and of landed property never made a losing venture, but went on accumulating and still accumulating, and for the most part withdrawing the

<sup>1</sup> On sale or alienation of lands, see Robertson, Introduction to Charles V.; Choiseul d'Aillecourt, note 80.

<sup>2</sup> Heeren, Werke, p. 149. Rappelons-nous l'encan général des fiefs et de tous les biens des Croisés. Au milieu de tant de vendeurs empressés, il se présentait peu d'acquéreurs, autre que les Eglises et les Communautés religieuses, qui n'abandonnaient pas leur patrie, et qui pouvoient placer des sommes considérables. They gained the direct domain of many fiefs, by failure of heirs to those who perished in the Holy Land.—Choiseul d'Aillecourt, p. 90.

largest portion of the land in every kingdom into a separate estate, which claimed exemption from all burdens of the realm, until the realm was compelled into measures, violent often and iniquitous in their mode, but still inevitable. The Church which had thus peaceably despoiled the world was in her turn unscrupulously despoiled.

III. The Crusades established in the Christian mind the justice and the piety of religious wars. Holiness of religious wars. The history of Christianity for five centuries is a perpetual Crusade; in this spirit and on these principles every war against unbelievers, either in the general doctrines of Christianity or in the dominant forms, was declared, waged, maintained. The cross was almost invariably the banner, the outward symbol; the object was the protection or the enlargement of the boundaries of the Church. The first Crusades might be in some degree vindicated as defensive. In the long and implacable contest the Mohammedan had no doubt been the aggressor; Islam first declared general and irreconcilable war against all hostile forms of belief; the propagation of faith in the Korân was the avowed aim of its conquests. The extent and rapidity of those conquests enforced toleration; conversion could not keep pace with subjugation; but the unconverted, the Jewish, or the Christian sank to an inferior, degraded, and tributary population. Nor was the spirit of conquest and invasion either satiated by success or broken by discomfiture. Neither the secure possession of their vast Asiatic dominions of Egypt, Africa, and Spain, nor their great defeat by Charles Martel, quelled their aggressive ambition. They were constantly renewing hostilities in every accessible part of the East and West,

threatening or still further driving in the frontier of the Byzantine Empire, covering the Mediterranean with their fleets, subduing Sicily, and making dangerous inroads and settlements in Italy. New nations or tribes from the remoter East, with all the warlike propensities of the Arabs, but with the fresh and impetuous valor of young proselytes to the Korân, were constantly pouring forth from the steppes of Tartary, the mountain glens of the Caucasus or the Himalaya, and infusing new life into Mohammedanism. The Turks had fully embraced its doctrines of war to all of hostile faith in their fiercest intolerance; they might seem imperiously to demand a general confederacy of Christendom against their declared enemy. Even the oppressions of their Christian brethren, oppressions avowedly made more cruel on account of their religion, within the dominions of the Mohammedans, might perhaps justify an armed interference. The indignities and persecutions to which the pilgrims, who had been respected up to this period, were exposed, the wanton and insulting desecration of the holy places, were a kind of declaration of war against everything Christian.

But it is more easy in theory than in fact to draw the line between wars for the defence and for the propagation of the faith. Religious war is too impetuous and eager not to become a fanaticism. From this period it was an inveterate, almost uncontested tenet, that wars for religion were not merely justifiable, but holy and Christian, and if holy and Christian, glorious above all other wars. The unbeliever was the natural enemy of Christ and of his Church; if not to be converted to be punished for the crime of un-

belief, to be massacred, exterminated by the righteous sword.

Charlemagne indeed had already carried simultaneously conquest and conversion into the forests of Germany ; but the wars against the Saxons still pretended to be defensive, to be the repulse of invasions on their part of the territories of the Empire, and the wanton destruction of churches within the Christian frontier. Baptism was among the terms of capitulation offered to conquered tribes, and accepted as the only secure guaranty for their future observance of peace.

But the actual crusades against Mohammedanism had not begun before they were diverted from their declared object — before they threw off all <sup>Crusades</sup> pretence to be considered defensive wars. <sup>aggressive.</sup>

The people had no sooner arms in their <sup>The Jews.</sup> hands than they turned them against the first enemies, according to the new code of Christ and of the Church, the unfortunate Jews. The frightful massacre of this race in all the flourishing cities in Germany and along the Rhine by the soldiers of the Cross seemed no less justifiable and meritorious than the subjugation of the more remote enemies of the Gospel. Why this fine discrimination between one class of unbelievers and another ? Shall zeal presume to draw distinctions between the wicked foes of the Church ? Even in the later Crusades it was an act of heroic Christian courage : no one but a St. Bernard would have dared, or dared with success, to distinguish with nice justice between the active and passive adversaries of the faith, the armed Saracen and the defenceless Jew. Long-suppressed hatred, jealousy of their wealth, revenge for their extortions, which prob-



ably, when almost every one was at their mercy, were intolerable enough (the Jew perhaps might, on his side, consider the invasion of the Holy Land an usurpation of his inalienable territory by the Christian, and might impose harder terms for his assistance in the purchase of arms and other provisions for that end); many old and many recent feelings of antipathy might still further designate the Jew as the enemy of the Christian cause; but it was as the Unbeliever, not the wealthy extortioner, that he was smitten with the sword. The Crusaders would not go in search of foreign foes of the Gospel, and leave in their homes men equally hateful, equally obstinate, equally designated for perdition in this world and in the next.

That which was lawful, just, and meritorious against the Jew and Mohammedan was so against the idolater. Out of Orders of Christian Knights for the defence of the Christian conquests in Palestine arose Orders of armed Apostles, for the conversion of the Heathen in the North of Germany. The Teutonic Knights were the brethren in arms of the Templars and Hospitallers of the Holy Land.

The heretic was no less odious, and therefore no less dangerous an enemy to the faith: he was a renegade to the true creed of the Gospel, a revolted subject of the Church. Popular opinion, as well as the decrees of the Pope, hallowed the exterminating wars against the Albigenses and other schismatics of the South of France, as undertaken for the cause of God. They were openly designated as Crusades. Simon de Montfort was as much the champion of the true faith as Godfrey of Boulogne. The In-

Crusades  
against  
heretics.



quisition itself was a Crusade in a more peaceful and judicial form ; it rested on the same principles, and executed against individuals that punishment which the Crusades accomplished by the open and indiscriminate carnage of war. Crusades were even preached and proclaimed against persons not charged with <sup>Against the Pope's ene-</sup> heresy. The Popes scrupled not to unfold <sup>mies.</sup> the banner of the Cross against any of their disobedient sons. The expedition against John of England by Philip of France, to reduce the refractory King to his obedience under his Papal liege lord, was called a Crusade. Philip of France was summoned to take arms as a true vassal of the Church against a rival Sovereign. At length every enemy of the political power of the Pope in Italy became as a heretic or an unbeliever. Crusades will hereafter be levied against those who dared impiously to attempt to set bounds to the temporal aggrandizement of the Roman See, or to the personal or nepotic ambition of the ruling Pontiff.

A new world of heathens was opened before this great dominant principle was effaced or weak- <sup>America.</sup> ened, at least in the Spanish mind. Spain had owed almost her national existence, her supremacy within her own peninsula to crusades of centuries with the Mohammedans. The conquest of Mexico by Cortes was a crusade ; the rapacity, and avarice, and passion for adventure in his followers, disguised itself, even to them, as a pious act for the propagation of the Gospel.

Philip II. justified his exterminating wars in the Low Countries and his hostilities against <sup>Philip II.</sup> England on the same principle as his ancestor Ferdinand the Catholic the expulsion of the Moors from Spain. That expulsion of the Moors was almost the

last impulse of the irreconcilable hostility which had been kindled in the heart of Christendom by the speech of Pope Urban at Clermont. The wars of the Low Countries were crusades, and finally the Spanish Armada — the last crusade — was swallowed up, we trust but we dare not vaticinate, with the crusading spirit, forever in the Ocean.

IV. A fourth result of the Crusades, if in its origin Chivalry. less completely so and more transitory and unreal yet in its remote influence felt and actually living in the social manners of our own time, was Chivalry; or at least the religious tone which Chivalry assumed in all its acts, language, and ceremonial. The Crusades swept away, as it were, the last impediment to the wedlock of religion with the warlike propensities of the age. All the noble sentiments, which blended together are chivalry — the high sense of honor, the disdain or passion for danger, the love of adventure, compassion for the weak or the oppressed, generosity, self-sacrifice, self-devotion for others — found in the Crusades their animating principle, perpetual occasion for their amplest exercise, their perfection and consummation. How could the noble Christian knight endure the insults to his Saviour and to his God, the galling shame that the place of his Redeemer's birth and death should be trampled by the scoffer, the denier of his Divinity? Where were adventures to be sought so stirring as in the distant, gorgeous, mysterious East, the land of fabled wealth, the birthplace of wisdom, of all the religions of the world; a land only to be approached by that which was then thought a remote and perilous voyage along the Mediterranean Sea, or by land through kingdoms inhabited by unknown

nations and people of strange languages ; through Constantinople, the traditions of whose wealth and magnificence prevailed throughout the West ? For whom was the lofty mind to feel compassion, if not for the down-trodden victim of Pagan mockery and oppression, his brother-worshipper of the Cross, who for that worship was suffering cruel persecution ? To what uses could wealth be so fitly or lavishly devoted as to the rescue of Christ's Sepulchre from the Infidel ? To what more splendid martyrdom could the valiant man aspire than to death in the fields which Christ had watered with his own blood ? What sacrifice could be too great ? Not even the absolute abnegation of home, kindred, the proud castle, the host of retainers, the sumptuous fare, for the tent on the desert, the scanty subsistence it might be (though this they would disdain to contemplate), the dungeon, the bondage in remote Syria. Lastly, and above all, where would be found braver or more worthy antagonists than among the Knights of the Crescent ; the invaders, too often it could not be denied, the conquerors of the Christian world ? Hence it was that France and Spain were preëminently the crusading kingdoms of Europe, and, as it were, the birthplace of chivalry : Spain as waging her unintermitting crusade against the Saracens of Granada and Cordova, France as furnishing by far the most numerous, and it may be said, with the Normans, the most distinguished leaders of the Crusades, from Godfrey of Boulogne down to Saint Louis ; so that the name of Frank and of Christian became almost equivalent in the East.

This singular union, this absolute fusion of the religion of peace with barbarous warfare ; this elevation

of the Christian knighthood, as it were, into a secondary hierarchy (even before the establishment of the military orders), had already in some degree begun before the Crusades. The ceremonial of investing the young noble warrior in his arms may be traced back to the German forests. The Church, which interfered in every human act, would hardly stand aloof from this important rite. She might well delude herself with the fond trust that she was not transgressing her proper bounds. The Church might seem to enter into this closer if incongruous alliance with the deliberate design of enslaving war to her own beneficent purposes. She had sometimes gone further; proclaimed a Truce of God; and war, at least private war, had ceased at her bidding.<sup>1</sup> The clerk, the pilgrim, the merchant, husbandman, pursued his work without fear; women were all secure; all ecclesiastical property, all mills, were under special protection.

But in such an age it could but be a truce, a brief, temporary, uncertain truce. By hallowing war, the Church might seem to divert it from its wanton and iniquitous destructiveness to better purposes, unattainable by her own gentle and persuasive influences; to confine it to objects of justice, even of righteousness; at all events, to soften and humanize the usages of war, which she saw to be inevitable. If, then, before the

<sup>1</sup> The whole question of the *Treuga Dei* is exhausted in the work of Datt. He thus describes (quoting de Marca de lib. Eccl. Gall.) and dates the first *Treuga Dei*. *Pacem et Treugam dici hanc a bellis privatis feriatiōnem, quod ratione clericorum omnium, peregrinorum, mercatorum, agriculturalium cum bobus aratoriis, Dominarum cum sociis suis omnibus mulierum omnium, rerum ad clericos monachosque pertinentium, et molendinarum pax ista omni tempore indulta est, ratione cæterorum vero Treuga, tantum, id est induciæ aliquot dierum. Primordia hujus ad annum 1032 aut 1034 referunt. — Radulf. Glaber, v. Datt, p. 11.*

Crusades, the Church had thus aspired to lay her spell upon war ; to enlist it, if not in the actual service of religion, in that of humanity, defence of the oppressed, the widow, the orphan, the persecuted or spoliated peasantry, how much more so when war itself had become religious ! The initiation, the solemn dedication to arms, now the hereditary right, almost the indispensable duty, of all high-born men, of princes or nobles (except where they had a special vocation to the Church or the cloister), became more and more formally and distinctly a religious ceremony. The noviciate of the knight was borrowed with strange but unperceived incongruity, from that of the monk or priest. Both were soldiers of Christ under a different form, and in a different sense. It was a proud day in the Castle (as it was in the cloister when some distinguished votary took the cowl) when the young heir assumed his arms. The vassals of all orders met around their liege lord ; they paid, perhaps, on this joyous occasion alone, their willing and ungrudged fees ; they enjoyed the splendor of the spectacle ; feasted, if at lower tables, in the same hall ; witnessed the jousts or military exercises, the gayer sports, the tricks of the jongleurs, and heard the romances of the Trouveurs. But the clergy were not absent ; the early and more impressive solemnity was theirs. The novice, after bathing, bound himself by a vow of chastity (not always too rigidly observed), to shed his blood for the faith, to have the thought of death ever present to his mind. He fasted till the evening, passed the night in prayer in the church or the castle chapel. At the dawn of morn he confessed ; as the evening before he had purified his body by the bath, so now his soul by the absolution ;



he heard mass, he partook of the Holy Eucharist. He knelt before his godfather in this war-baptism. He was publicly sworn to maintain the right, to be loyal to all true knighthood, to protect the poor from oppression. He must forswear all treason, all injustice. Where woman needed his aid, he must be ever prompt and valiant; to protect her virtue was the first duty and privilege of a true knight. He must fast every Friday, give alms according to his means, keep faith with all the world, especially his brethren in arms, succor, love, honor, all loyal knights. When he had taken his oath, knights and ladies arrayed him in his armor: each piece had its symbolic meaning, its moral lesson. His godfather then struck him with a gentle blow, and laid his sword three times on his neck — “In the name of God, St. Michael (or St. George, or some other tutelar Saint), and (ever) of our Lady, we dub thee knight.” The church bells pealed out; the church rang with acclamations; the knight mounted his horse, and rode round the lists, or over the green meadows, amid the shouts of the rejoicing multitude.

But what young knight, thus dedicated, could doubt that the conquest of the Holy Land was among his primary duties, his noblest privileges? Every knight was a soldier of the Cross; every soldier of the Cross almost enlisted for this great object. There could be no doubt of the justice of his cause, nor of the enemies whom it was his duty to attack and to slaughter without remorse. The infidel, as much as the giant or dragon of romance, was the natural foe of the Christian. Every oppressed Christian (and every Christian in the Holy Land was oppressed) was the object of his sworn protection. Slaying Saracens took rank with



fastings, penitential discipline, visits to shrines, even almsgivings, as meritorious of the Divine mercy. So by the Crusades chivalry became more religious, religion more chivalrous; for it was now no unusual, no startling sight, as the knight had become in one sense part of the hierarchy, to behold bishops, priests, serving, fighting as knights. In a holy war the bishop and the abbot stood side by side with the prince or the noble; struck as lusty blows; if they conquered, disdained not the fame; if they fell, supposed that they had as good a right to the honor of martyrdom.

Even the most incongruous and discordant part of chivalry, the devotion to the female sex, took a religious tone. There was one Lady of whom, high above all and beyond all, every knight was the special servant. It has been remarked that in the French language the Saviour and his Virgin Mother are worshipped under feudal titles (*Notre Seigneur, Notre Dame*). If the adoration of the Virgin, the culminating point of chivalrous devotion to the female sex, is at times leavened with phrases too nearly allied with human passion, the general tone to the earthly mistress is purified in word, if not always in thought, by the reverence which belongs to the Queen of Heaven. This was the poetry of chivalry — the religious poetry; and in an imaginative age the poetry, if far, very far above the actual life, cannot be absolutely without influence on that life. If this ideal love, in general, existed only in the outward phrase, in the ceremonial address, in the sonnet, or in the song; if, in fact, the Christianized Platonic love of chivalry in real life too often degenerated into gross licentiousness; if the sanctity of marriage, which permitted without scruple, the homage,

the adoration of the true knight in consideration of his valor and fidelity, was not only perpetually endangered, but habitually violated, and the violation became the subject of sympathy rather than of reprobation; yet, on the whole, the elevation, even the inharmonious religiousness of chivalry, must have wrought for the benefit of mankind. War itself became, if not less sanguinary, conducted with more mutual respect, with some restraint. Christian chivalry, in Spain and in the Holy Land, encountered Asiatic Mohammedan chivalry. For in the Arab, in most of the Oriental races, there was a native chivalry, as among the Teutonic or European Christians. If Achilles, as has been finely said, is a model of knighthood, so is the Arabian Antar. But both Achilles and Antar may meet in Richard Cœur de Lion; though Saladin, perhaps (and Saladin described by Christian as well as Mohammedan writers), may transcend all three.<sup>1</sup> Hence sprang courtesy, at least an initiatory humanity in war; hence that which proclaimed itself, which might have been expected to continue, the most bloody, remorseless, internecine strife, gradually became subject to the ordinary laws of war, in some respects to a restraint above the prevailing laws of war. Thus the most intolerant strife worked itself into something bordering on toleration. There was a contest of honor, as of arms.

If, finally, the Crusades infused into the mind of Europe a thirst for persecution long indelible; if they furnished an authority for persecution which wasted continents, and darkened centuries with mutual hos-

<sup>1</sup> Compare Mr. Hallam's passage on chivalry. It were presumption now to praise that book; but I may be permitted to say, that this is one of the very best passages in the *History of the Middle Ages*. — Boston Ed. vol. iii. p. 380.

tility ; yet Chivalry, at once, as it were, the parent and the child of the Crusades, left upon European manners, especially in the high-born class, a punctilious regard for honor, a generous reverence for justice, and a hatred (perhaps a too narrow and aristocratical hatred) of injustice ; a Teutonic respect for the fair sex ; an element, in short, of true nobleness, of refinement, of gentleness, and of delicacy. The chivalrous word courtesy designates a new virtue, not ordained by our religion ; and words are not formed but out of the wants, usages, and sentiments of men ; and courtesy is not yet an obsolete term. Even gallantry, now too often sunk to a frivolous or unnatural sense, yet retains something of its old nobility, when it comprehended valor, frankness, honorable devotion to woman. The age of chivalry may be gone, but the influences of chivalry, it may be hoped, mingling with and softened by purer religion, will be the imperishable heirloom of social man.

## BOOK VIII.

## CONTEMPORARY CHRONOLOGY.

[illegible]

## CONTEMPORARY CHRONOLOGY.

KINGS OF ENGLAND.		KINGS OF SPAIN.		KINGS OF DENMARK.		EMPERORS OF THE EAST.		ARCHBISHOPS OF MILAN.	
A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.
William Rufus 1100		1072 Alfonso I. 1109		1095 Erick I. 1105		1081 Alexius I. 1118		1097 Anselm IV. 1101	
1100 Henry I. 1135		1109 Urraca 1126		1105 Nicolas 1134				1102 Grossolano 1112	
		1126 Alfonso II. 1157						1112 Giordano 1120	
		Sancho III. 1158				1118 John I. 1143		1120 Ulrick 1126	
		1158 Alfonso 1214						1126 Anselm V. 1136	
1135 Stephen 1154		ARRAGON.		1134 Erick II. 1137				1136 Robaldo 1145	
		1094 Peter I. 1104		1137 Erick III. 1147					
		1104 Alfonso I. 1134				1143 Manuel 1180		1145 Oberto 1106	
1154 Henry II. 1189		1134 Ramiro II. 1137		1147 Sweno IV.					
		1137 Petronella and Raymond 1162		Canute V. 1156-7					
				1157 Waldemar 1181					
		1162 Alfonso II. 1196						1166 Galdino 1176	
1189 Richard I. 1199		1196 Pedro II. 1213						1176 Algisi 1184	
ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.		PORTUGAL.		1181 Canute VI. 1202		1180 Alexius II. 1183		1184 Uberto Crivelli 1187	
Anselm 1109		1100 Henry 1112				1183 Andronicus I. 1185		1187 Milo de Cordano 1195	
1114 Ralph 1122						1185 Isaac Angelus 1195			
1122 William 1127						1195 Alexius III. 1204		1195 Oberto II. 1196	
1127 Corbell 1138								1196 Philip de Compagnara 1206	
1138 Theobald 1161		1112 Alfonso 1185							
1162 T. Becket 1173									
1173 Richard 1184									
1184 Baldwin 1191									
1191 Reginald 1192		1185 Sancho I. 1212							
1192 Hubert									

## BOOK VIII.



## CHAPTER I.

## END OF THE EMPEROR HENRY IV.

THE hundred years which elapsed between the death of Urban II. and the accession of Innocent III. in whom the Papal power attained its utmost height, were nearly coincident with the twelfth century. Of the sixteen Popes who ruled during this period, the Pontificates of two, Paschal II. and Alexander III., occupy near forty years. The reigns of Calixtus II., of Innocent II., and of Adrian IV., are distinguished each by its memorable event; the first by the settlement of the dispute concerning the investitures in the compact of Worms; the second by the coronation of Lothair the Saxon, and the intimate alliance between the Papacy and the Empire; the third by the coronation of Frederick Barbarossa and the execution of Arnold of Brescia.

It was an age of great men and of great events, preparing the world for still greater. It was the age of the Crusades, not merely the expeditions of vast undisciplined hordes, or the leagues of knights, nobles, and princes, but the regular armies of great sovereigns at the head of the powers of their kingdoms. Two Em-



perors of Germany, two Kings of France, and one of England, at different times led their forces for the recovery of the holy sepulchre. The close of the last century beheld the rise, the present will behold the fall of the kingdom of Jerusalem ; the vain attempt of Philip Augustus of France and of Richard of England to restore it ; the rise of the military orders, the Knights of St. John and the Templars, their organization, their long and stubborn resistance to Mohammedanism in its Asiatic territory ; their retreat to take their defensive stand on the frontiers of Christendom ; the final triumph of the unconquerable Saladin ; after which the East settled down again under the scarce-disturbed and iron sway of Mohammedanism. The later Crusades were diverted to other quarters, to Constantinople and to Egypt ; the Emperor Frederick II. alone visited the Holy Land, and by negotiation rather than by arms obtained better terms of capitulation for the Christians.

Western Christendom, in this age, beheld in France the growing power of the monarchy ; in England the first ineffectual struggles of the nation and of the king for ecclesiastical freedom ; in Germany the rise of the House of Hohenstaufen, the most formidable, for a time the most successful antagonists of the Papacy ; in Italy the foundation of the Lombard republics, the attempt to set up a temporal commonwealth in Rome ; the still growing ascendancy of the Papacy, notwithstanding the perpetual or ever-renewed schism, and the aspirations of the Romans to share in the general establishment of republican institutions.

Nor was it only the age in which new political views began to develop themselves, and the temporal affairs

of Christendom to take a more permanent form ; a great intellectual movement was now approaching. Men appeared, whose thoughts and studies began to awaken the slumbering mind of Europe. Their own or after ages have felt and recognized the power of Anselm, Abélard, Bernard of Clairvaux, and Arnold of Brescia. The religious republicanism of Arnold, the least intellectual impulse, was that which produced the most immediate but the least enduring effects : he was crushed by the uncongenial times. The strong arm of the temporal and ecclesiastical power combined to put down the rebel against both. To all outward appearance the doctrines of Arnold perished with him on his funeral pyre. They may have lurked among the more odious hidden tenets of some among the heretical sects which were persecuted so violently during the next century ; kindred principles are so congenial to human nature, and so sure to be provoked into being by the inordinate wealth and ambition of the Church, that no doubt they were latent and brooding in many hearts : but Arnold founded no sect, left no writings, had no avowed followers. Those who in later times advanced similar tenets, Wycliffe, Huss, Savonarola, may never have heard of their premature ancestor. Of the other three great names, Bernard was the intellectual representative of his own age, Anselm the forerunner of that which was immediately to come, Abélard of one far more remote. Bernard has been called the last of the Fathers ; Anselm was the parent of the schoolmen ; Abélard the prophet of a bolder and severer philosophy, the distant harbinger of Descartes, of Locke, and of Kant. Each must find his proper place in our history.

Paschal II., another monk of Clugny, already a cardinal of the Church, succeeded Urban II. He had been bred in the school of Gregory VII., but with much of the ambition he possessed not the obstinate fortitude of his predecessors. The death of the Antipope Clement, expelled at length from Rome by Pope Paschal immediately on his accession, followed during the year after that of Urban. Guibert of Ravenna must have been a man of strong resolution, great capacity, and power of commanding respect and ardent attachment. He had not only an active and faithful party while he had hopes of attaining the ascendancy, but his adherents, many of whom no doubt could have made their peace by disloyalty to their master, clung fondly to him under the most adverse circumstances. His death did not extinguish their affections; the followers of the Antipope declared that many miracles were wrought at his tomb.

Pope  
Paschal II.  
A.D. 1099.  
Aug. 13, 14.

A.D. 1100.  
September.

Christendom might hope that the schism would expire with this rival of so many Popes. The Imperial party in Italy whose interest it might have been, if still powerful, to contest the see, was utterly depressed, and indeed so nearly extinct that it might seem the better policy to conciliate the ruling pontiff. The Emperor Henry had retired beyond the Alps, discomfited, broken in spirit by the revolt of his son, in affliction, in disgust, in despair. The affairs of Germany, as he descended the Alps, might appear no less dark and unpromising. His enemies had gained the ascendancy in almost all parts; they had established a truce throughout the Empire, which might seem to overawe any attempts on his part to resume his power, while it left them to

pursue their intrigues and strengthen their alliances at their pleasure.

The presence of Henry in his native land appeared to work a sudden revolution in his favor. Germany, with a generous sympathy, seemed disposed to console her now aged Emperor for the wrongs and afflictions which he had suffered in Italy. In a few years he found himself sufficiently powerful to establish a more perfect, it might be hoped an enduring, Peace of the Empire; and Germany assented to his just revenge against his revolted son Conrad, by assenting to his demand to devolve the inheritance of his German crown on his younger son Henry.

Many circumstances conspired in favor of the Emperor. The German leagues seemed fated to fall asunder from the mutual jealousy of the princes. Duke Guelf of Bavaria had been driven into Henry's party by his indignation at the conduct of the Countess Matilda, and the fraud which he asserted she had practised on his son. She had tempted the youth to marriage by the hopes of her vast patrimony, which she had deliberately in broken faith settled on the Church. His only chance of wresting away that patrimony, to which he asserted his son's right, was by the aid of Henry. He became an ardent Imperialist.

The Crusades had not produced the same effects in Germany as in France, in Burgundy, and in other countries in Europe. They had not drained away and were not continuing to drain away to the same extent the turbulent and enterprising of the population. The more calm or sluggish German devotion had not kindled to the same violent enthusiasm. It was no less strong and profound, but was content

Strong re-  
action in  
favor of  
Henry.

Effect of  
Crusades.

with a more peaceful and, as it were, domestic sphere. Just before the Crusades the monastic system had shown a sudden and powerful impulse to development and extension. New monasteries had been founded on a magnificent scale; knights and princes had retired into cloisters; laymen by thousands, especially in Swabia, made over their estates to these religious institutions, and even where they did not take the vows, pledged themselves to live according to the rule, to forsake their secular employments, and devote themselves to the service of monks and ecclesiastics. The daughters of free peasants formed themselves into religious sisterhoods under the direction of some respected priest, and the inhabitants of whole villages embraced at once the religious life, and vied with each other in their austerities.<sup>1</sup>

Still the Crusades absorbed the public mind, and diverted it for a time from the internal feuds of the Empire. Germany, where not drawn away by the torrent of fanaticism, was suddenly called upon to defend itself against the lawless votaries of the cross. The crusading cause was by no means commended to respect or to emulation by the general sufferings witnessed or endured in many parts of the land from the Crusaders. The hordes of the first loose and ungoverned soldiers of the cross passed through Germany restrained by no discipline, and considering their holy cause not merely an expiation for their former sins, but a license for sinning more freely, from the assurance of full pardon in the Holy Land. The first swarm under Walter Perejo and his nephew Walter the Pennyless, with eight knights to command 15,000 men, had straggled

<sup>1</sup> Stenzel, page 560. Bernold, sub ann. 1091.



through the whole of Germany from Cologne, where he parted from Peter the Hermit, to the frontiers of Hungary. Then followed Peter the Hermit, whose eloquence was not without effect on the lower orders. His host gathered as it advanced through Bavaria, Swabia, Austria, till from 15,000 it had swollen to 40,000 followers, without the least attempt at array or organization. Two other armies brought up the rear, one from Lorraine and the Lower Rhine, led by the ferocious Emico, Count of Leiningen, the other under the priests Folkmar and Gotschalk, a man whose fanaticism was suspected to be subservient to baser sordid motives. The march of these formidable hosts spread terror throughout the whole land. They had begun by the massacre of the Jews in the great cities on the Rhine; their daily sustenance was by plunder, or from that compulsory provision for their necessities which was plunder in another form, and which was reluctantly doled out in order to get rid of the unwelcome guests. All this tended to quell rather than awaken the crusading enthusiasm among the Germans, who had few examples either among their princes or princely bishops to urge them into the tide. The aged Guelf of Bavaria, almost alone among the sovereign princes, the Bishops of Salzburg, Passau, and Strasburg, among the great prelates, the two first strong anti-Imperialists, left their palaces; and as of these not one returned to his native land, their example rather repressed than excited the ardor of others.

The secret of the Emperor's quiet resumption of power lay no doubt in a great degree in the preoccupation of men's minds with this absorbing subject. His first act on his return to Germany

The Emperor  
resumes his  
power.



was one of generous justice and humanity — the protection of the persecuted Jews. This truly imperial conduct was not without its advantage. He exacted severe restitution of all the wealth plundered from these unhappy men ; that, however, of those who had been murdered was escheated, as without lawful owner, to the Imperial treasury. Some of the ecclesiastics had behaved with Christian humanity. The Bishops of Worms and of Spire ran some risk in saving as many as they could of this defenceless people. The Archbishop of Treves, less generous, gave them refuge in his palace on condition that they would submit to baptism. Some of the kindred of Ruthard, the Archbishop of Mentz, had joined in the general pillage ; the prelate was more than suspected of participation in the guilt and in the booty. When summoned to an account he fled from the city, and with his kindred shut himself up in the strong castle of Hardenberg in the Thuringian forest. The Emperor seized the revenues of the see, but took no steps to depose the Prelate. It was probably from this time that the Jews were taken under feudal protection by the Emperor ; they became his men, owing to him special allegiance, and with full right therefore to his protection. This privilege, in after times, they bought dearly, being constantly subject to heavy exactions, which were enforced by merciless persecutions.

The Emperor had already reinstated Guelf of Bavaria in his dukedom, and entailed the inheritance on his sons. Henry held a Diet at Mentz to Dec. 1097. settle the contested claims of Swabia. A satisfactory arrangement was made, by which the rising house of Hohenstaufen became Dukes of Northern Swabia.

For their rival, Berthold of Zahringen, a new dukedom was created, comprehending Zurich, the country between the Jura and the St. Bernard, with his patrimonial Countship of the Brisgau. Of all the great princes and prelates none were in hostility to the Emperor but the fugitive Archbishop of Mentz.

Henry seized the favorable opportunity to compass the great object which he had at heart. He urged upon the princes and bishops, in public and in private, the unnatural rebellion of his son Conrad, who had conspired against the crown, and even the life of his father. He pressed the fatal example of such treason against a sovereign and a parent. Conrad had justly forfeited his claim to the succession, which fell of right to his younger brother Henry. To Conrad there could be no attachment among the princes in Germany; if known, he could only be known as a soft and fantastic youth. He had fallen into contempt, notwithstanding his royal title, in Italy, as a mere instrument in the hands of the crafty Matilda and of the Pope. Sympathy with the injured father, and prudent considerations for the interest of the Empire, as well as the urgent solicitations of the Emperor, swayed the majority of the Jan. 6, 1099. princes. In a great Diet at Cologne, Conrad was declared to have forfeited his title. With unanimous consent the succession was adjudged to his younger brother Henry, who was anointed King at Aix-la-Chapelle. The suspicious father exacted a solemn oath from his son, that during his father's lifetime, and without his permission, he would neither claim the government of the Empire, nor even the patrimonial territories. As if oaths would bind a son who should despise the affection and authority of a father!

The death of Conrad removed all fears of July, 1101. a contention between the brothers for the Imperial Crown.

All was prosperity with Henry: his turbulent and agitated life seemed as if it would close in an august and peaceful end. By skilful concessions, by liberal grants, by courteous demeanor, he reconciled, or more firmly attached the Princes of Saxony, Bohemia, and other parts of Germany to his cause. Even religious hatred seemed to be dying away; his unrepealed excommunication was forgotten; and some of the severest ecclesiastics of the Papal party condescended to accept promotion from the hands of the interdicted Sovereign.

The Emperor proclaimed Peace throughout the land and the realm for four years;<sup>1</sup> he required Peace of the empire. Jan. A.D. 1103. a solemn oath from the princes to maintain this peace; he imposed heavy penalties on its violation; and (in these times a wonderful and unprecedented event!) the Emperor was obeyed. The writers of the period speak of the effects of this peace on all classes and conditions, especially on the poor and defenceless, with admiring astonishment. The ways became safe, commerce began to flourish; the cultivation of the land went happily on. What seemed most astonishing was, that boats could descend the large rivers without being stopped and plundered by the great cities on the banks; who might be in want of their corn and other commodities; that the powerful were held in check; that might for a time ceased to be right. The truce of the Empire, though proclaimed by the excommunicated Henry, was as well observed and as great a blessing as the truce of God at times proclaimed by the Pope or

<sup>1</sup> Land und Reich's Friede. It comprehended private and public wars.

the hierarchy.<sup>1</sup> Still the fatal excommunication hung over the head of Henry. The golden opportunity was missed of putting an end to the schism, on the death of the Antipope Guibert, without loss of dignity ; of obtaining from a Pontiff of Paschal's more pliant character less injurious terms. The miserable failure of the attempt to support a successor to Guibert ought to have urged the same policy. Three were appointed in succession : one, Theodore, fled from the city immediately that he was invested in his perilous honors. One hundred and five days after he was in the power of Paschal, condemned to be a hermit.<sup>2</sup> The second, Albert, was chosen Pope and "disposed" in the same day ; dragged on a horse with his face to the tail before the Pope, who sat in state in the Lateran ; he was thrust into the monastery of St. Laurence, in Aversa.<sup>3</sup> The third, Maginolfo, who took the name of Silvester IV., had a longer Papal life. He had been raised by a strong party hostile to Paschal II., but was abandoned by all, and eventually deposed by the Emperor himself.<sup>4</sup> To this more pacific course, the recognition of Paschal, the Emperor was strongly persuaded by his wiser friends : he even announced his intention of visiting Rome to effect a reconciliation of all parties by his personal presence ; to submit to a General Council the whole dispute between himself and the Pope. It would have been well not to have announced this intention to which it was difficult to adhere, and which he had strong motives to

A.D. 1105.  
Nov. 18.

<sup>1</sup> Vita Henrici, p. 386.

<sup>2</sup> Pandulph Pisan., 1. Ann. Roman., 1.

<sup>3</sup> This was the one who, according to Muratori's expression, was disposed, dispaato. — Annal. Roman. Pandulph Pisan.

<sup>4</sup> Annal. Leodicen. apud Pertz. — Annales Roman.

renounce. Henry may naturally have shrunk from venturing again on the inhospitable soil of Italy, so fatal to his glory and his peace. He may have hesitated to leave the affairs of Germany in their yet precarious state; for the peace had neither been proclaimed nor accepted by the princes. Many of the Imperialist bishops may have been alarmed lest their titles, resting on the authority of the Antipope, might be shaken by any concession to that Pope who had condemned them as usurpers of their sees.

Henry appeared not in Italy; and Paschal proceeded without delay to renew the Excommunication. This sentence is remarkable, as being recorded by one who himself heard it delivered

Paschal ex-  
communi-  
cates Henry.  
A.D. 1102.

by the Pope. "Because the King, Henry, has never ceased to rend the vesture of Christ, that is, to lay waste the Church by plunder and conflagration; to defile it by his sensualities, his perjuries, and his homicides; and hath therefore, first by Pope Gregory of blessed memory, afterwards by the most holy Urban, my predecessor, on account of his contumacy, been excommunicated and condemned: We also, in this our Synod, by the judgment of the whole Church, deliver him up to a perpetual anathema. And this we would have known to all, especially to those beyond the Alps, that they may abstain from all fellowship in his iniquity."<sup>1</sup>

This renewal of the excommunication had no immediate effect on the fidelity either of Henry's temporal or spiritual subjects. Many ecclesiastics of high rank and character were about his court; above all, Otho

<sup>1</sup> March 12. Urspergensis. See Mansi, Concil. Ann. 1102. Eccard, Chronic. ap. Pertz, vi. 224.



the Apostle of Pomerania. Otho had been compelled with difficulty to accept the bishopric of Bamberg. "The ambitious man," said the Emperor to the Ambassadors from that city, "he has already refused two bishoprics, Halberstadt and Augsburg, and would now reject the third." Otho accepted the investiture of the fief from Henry, but required the assent of the Pope to his consecration. In other respects this holy man was on the most intimate footing with the Emperor; his private chaplain, who instructed him in the Church psalmody. The Emperor even learned to sing and to compose Church music. Otho prepared for him a course of sermons for the whole year, so short as to be easily retained in the memory.

Nor did this violent measure of the Pope provoke the Emperor to hostility. At the same time that he established peace throughout the Empire, he endeavored with apparent earnestness to restore peace to the Church. He publicly announced his intention, as soon as he should be reconciled to the Pope, to make over the Empire to his son, and to undertake a Crusade to the Holy Land. Many of the more distinguished warriors of Germany were prepared to follow his footsteps.

But this most secure and splendid period in the life of Henry IV. was like one calm and brilliant hour of evening before a night of utter gloom. The greatest act of his power, the establishment of peace throughout the Empire, was fatal to that power. The proclamation of war against Mohammedanism was the triumph, the confirmation of the Pope's supremacy; the maintenance of peace the ruin of the Emperor. At the same time when the interdict seemed to sit so lightly upon him, it was working in secret, and reconciling

his most faithful followers to treason and to rebellion.

The peace — so precious and so unwonted a blessing to the lower orders, to the peasant, the artisan, the trader, which made the roads and rivers alive with commerce — was not merely irksome, it was degrading and ruinous to the warlike nobles. The great feudatories more immediately around the court complained that the Emperor had not only deprived them of their occupation, of their glory, of their power; but that he was deluding them with a false promise of employing their eager and enterprising valor in the Holy Land. They were wasting their estates on soldiers for whom they had no use, and in idle but costly attendance on a court which dallied with their noble solicitude for active life. Throughout the Empire the princes had for thirty restless years enjoyed the proud privilege of waging war against their neighbors, of maintaining their armed followers by the plunder of their enemies, or of the peaceful commercial traveller. This source of wealth, of power, of busy occupation, was cut off. They could no longer sally from their impreg-<sup>Unpopu-</sup>nable castles and bring home the rich and <sup>larity of</sup> peace. easy booty. While the low-born vulgar were rising in opulence or independence, they were degraded to distress and ruin and famine. Their barns and cellars were no longer stocked with the plundered produce of neighboring fields or vineyards; they were obliged to dismiss or to starve their once gallant and numerous retinue.<sup>1</sup> He who was accustomed to ride abroad on a foaming courser was reduced to a sorry nag; he who disdained to wear any robes which were not dyed with

<sup>1</sup> Vita Henrici apud Pertz.

purple must now appear in coarse attire of the same dull color which it had by nature. Among the princes of the Empire it was more easy to establish than to maintain peace. The old jealousies and animosities were constantly breaking out; the Bavarian house looked with suspicion on the favor shown to that of Saxony. Lawless acts were committed, either in popular insurrection or in sudden quarrels (as in the murder of Count Sighard near Ratisbon). Dark rumors were immediately propagated of connivance, at least of indolent negligence, on the part of the Emperor. The dissatisfaction was deep, dangerous, universal. The rebellion was ripe, it wanted but a cause and a leader.

The Emperor had seen with delight the intimacy which had grown up between his son and the nobles in his court. This popularity might strengthen and secure his succession to the throne. The Prince, in all the ardor of youth, joined in their sports, their huntings, their banquets, and in less seemly diversions. The associates of a prince soon grow into a party. The older and more subtle enemies of Henry, the Papal or religious faction, saw this, too, with pleasure. They availed themselves of these younger agents to provoke and inflame his ambition. It was time, they suggested, that he should be released from the yoke of his weak and aged but severe father; that he should no longer live as a slave without any share or influence in public affairs; the succession, his lawful right, might now be his own, if he would seize it. What it might be after his father's death, what rivals might contest it, who could foresee? or even in his father's lifetime; for it depended entirely on his caprice. He had disinherited one son, he might another. The son's oath, his extorted

oath of obedience, was itself invalid; for it had been pledged to an excommunicated person; it was already annulled by the sentence of the Church.

The Emperor was without the least apprehension, or even suspicion of this conspiracy. With his son he set out at the head of an army to punish a certain Count Theodoric, who had surprised Hartwig the Archbishop Elect and the Burgrave of Magdeburg on their way to Liege, where the Prelate was to receive his investiture from the Emperor. The Papal party had chosen another Archbishop, Henry, who had been al- Revolt of Prince Henry. ready expelled from the see of Paderborn.

They had reached Fritzlar, when the Prince Henry suddenly left his father's camp, fled to Ratisbon, where he was joined by many of the younger nobles and princes, and raised the standard of revolt.

No sooner had the Emperor heard of his son's flight than he sent messengers after messengers to implore him to respect his solemn oath, to remember his duty to his father, his allegiance to his sovereign, and not to expose himself to the scorn and hatred of mankind. The son sent back a cold reply, that he could have nothing to do with one under sentence of ex- Dec. 1104. communication. In deep sorrow Henry returned to Mentz; the Archbishop of Cologne and Duke Frederick of Swabia undertook the pious office of reconciling the son and the father. The son rejected all their advances until his father should be reconciled to the Church.

No evidence implicates the Pope in the guilt of suggesting or advising this impious and unnatural rebellion. But the first act of the young Henry was to consult the Pope as to the obligation of his oath of

allegiance. The holy father, daringly ascribing this dissension between the son and his parent to the inspiration of God, sent him without reserve the apostolic blessing, and gave him absolution, on condition that he should rule with justice and be faithful to the Church, for his rebellion against his father, an absolution in the final judgment of Christ!<sup>1</sup>

So was Germany plunged again into a furious civil war. Everywhere in the State and in the Church the old factions broke out in unmitigated ferocity. The papal clergy were the first to show their weariness of the unwelcome peace. At a meeting at Goslar the clergy of Saxony resolved to expel all the intruding and Simoniac bishops (those who had received investiture from the Emperor), if alive, from their sees, if dead, to dig up their bodies and cast them out of the churches; to reordain by Catholic hands all whom those prelates had received into orders, to interdict the exercise of any function in the Church to the married clergy.

The young Henry conducted his own affairs with consummate vigor, subtlety, perfidy, and hypocrisy. In a great assembly of bishops, abbots, monks, and clergy, as well as of the people, at Nordhausen, he appeared without the dress or ensigns of royalty, and refused to ascend the throne; but while he declared himself ready to confirm all the old laws and usages of the realm, he dared to pray with profuse tears for the conversion of his father, protested that he had not revolted against

<sup>1</sup> So writes an ecclesiastical chronicler. "Apostolicus, ut audivit inter patrem et filium dissidium, *sperans hoc a Deo evenire . . . de hoc commisso sibi promittens absolutionem in judicio futuro.*" — Annal. Hildesheim.



him with any view to the succession or with any design to depose him; that on the instant of his reconciliation with the Pope he would submit in dutiful fidelity. The simple multitude were deluded by his tears; the assembly broke out into an unanimous shout of approbation; the Kyrie Eleison was sung by priests and people with accordant earnestness.

The tragedy was hastening towards its close. In every quarter the Emperor found lukewarmness, treachery, and desertion. Prelates who had basked in his favor were suddenly convinced of their sin in communicating with an interdicted man, and withdrew from the court. The hostile armies were in presence not far from Ratisbon; the leaders were seized with an unwonted respect for human life, and with dread of the horrors of civil war. The army of the son retired, but remained unbroken, that of the father melted away and dispersed. He was obliged to take refuge in Mentz. Once before young Henry had moved towards Mentz to reinstate the expelled Archbishop Ruthard, the man accused of the plunder and even of the massacre of the Jews. Thence he had retired, being unable to cross the Rhine; now, however, he effected his passage with little difficulty, having bribed the officer commanding in Spire. Before Mentz the son coldly rejected all propositions from his father to divide the Empire, and to leave the decision of all disputes between them to the Diet. He still returned the same stern demand of an impossible preliminary to negotiation — his father's reconciliation with the Church: but as if with some lingering respect, he advised the Emperor to abandon Mentz, lest he should fall into the hands of his enemies. Henry fled to the strong castle of Hammerstein, from

thence to Cologne. The Archbishop of Cologne had already taken the stronger side; the citizens were true to the Emperor. A Diet was summoned at Metz, at which the legate of the Pope was to be present. The Emperor hastily collected all the troops he could command on the Lower Rhine, and advanced to break up this dangerous council. The army of the younger Henry having obtained some advantage stood opposed to that of the father on the banks of the Rhine not far from Coblentz. But the son, so long as he could compass his ends by treachery, would not risk his cause on the doubtful issue of a battle. An interview took place on the banks of the Moselle. At the sight of his son the passionate fondness of the father overpowered all sense of dignity or resentment. He threw himself at the feet of young Henry; he adjured him by the welfare of his soul. "I know that my sins deserve the chastisement of God, but do not thou sully thy honor and thy name. No law of God obliges a son to be the instrument of divine vengeance against his father." The son seemed deeply moved; he bowed to the earth beside his father, entreated his forgiveness with many tears, promised obedience as a son, allegiance as a vassal, if his father would give satisfaction to the Church. He proposed that both should dismiss their armies, each with only three hundred knights repair to Mentz, to pass together the holy season of Christmas. There he solemnly swore that he would labor for lasting reconciliation. The Emperor gave orders to disband his army. In vain his more cautious and faithful followers remonstrated against this imprudence. He only summoned his son again, who lulled his suspicions by a second solemn oath for his safety. At Bingen they

passed the night together; the son showed the most profound respect, the father yielded himself up to his long-suppressed feelings of love. The night was spent in free and tender conversation with his son, not unmingled with caresses. Little thought he, writes the historian, that this was the last night in which he would enjoy the luxury of parental fondness. The following day pretexts were found for conveying the Emperor, not to Mentz, but to the strong castle of Bechelheim near Kreuznach. Henry could but remind his son of the perils and difficulties which he had undergone to secure him the succession to the Empire. A third time young Henry pledged his own head for the security of his father. Yet no sooner was he, with a few attendants, within the castle, than the gates were closed — the Emperor Henry IV. was a prisoner! His jailer was a churchman, his enemy the Bishop Gebhard of Spire, whom he had formerly expelled from his see. Either from neglect or cruelty he was scantily provided with food; he was denied a barber to shave his beard and the use of the bath. The inexorable bigot would not permit the excommunicated ministrations of a priest, still less the Holy Eucharist on the Lord's Nativity. He was compelled by menaces against his life to command the surrender of all the regalia which had been left in the castle of Hammerstein.

The Diet, attended by almost all the magnates of the Empire, assembled at Mentz; but it was not safe to bring the fallen Henry before that meeting, for there, as elsewhere, the honest popular sympathy was strong on the side of the father and of the Emperor. He was carried to the castle of Ingelheim in the Palatinate; there, stripped of every ensign of royalty, bro-

ken by indignities of all kinds, by the insolent triumph of his foes, the perfidy of his friends, the Emperor stood before a Diet composed entirely of his enemies, the worst of those enemies his son, and the Papal Legate at their head. He was urged, on peril of his life, to abdicate. "On that condition," he inquired, "will ye guarantee my life?" The Legate of the Pope replied, and demanded this further condition; he should publicly acknowledge that he had unjustly persecuted the holy Gregory, wickedly set up the Antipope Guibert, and oppressed the Church. In vain he strove for less humiliating terms, and even for delay and for a more regular judgment. His inexorable enemies offered him but this alternative or perpetual imprisonment. He then implored that, at least, if he conceded all, he might be at once released from excommunication. The Cardinal replied, that was beyond his powers; the Emperor must go to Rome to be absolved. All were touched with some compassion except the son. The Emperor surrendered everything, his castles, his treasures, his patrimony, his empire: he declared himself unworthy to reign any longer.

The Diet returned to Mentz, elected and invested Henry V. in the Empire, with the solemn warning that if he did not rule with justice and protect the Church, he must expect the fate of his father. A deputation of the most distinguished prelates from every part of Germany was sent to Rome to settle the terms of reconciliation between the Empire and the Pope.

But in the German people the natural feelings of justice and of duty, the generous sympathies with age and greatness and cruel wrong, were

People in  
favor of  
Henry IV.

not extinguished, as in the hearts of the princes by hatred and ambition, in the ecclesiastics by hatred and bigotry. In a popular insurrection at Colmar, caused partly by the misconduct of his own troops, the new Emperor was discomfited and obliged to fly A.D. 1106. with the loss of the regalia of the Empire. The old Henry received warning from some friendly hand that nothing now awaited him but perpetual imprisonment or death. He made his escape to Cologne; the citizens heard the account of his sufferings with indignant compassion, and at once embarked in his cause. He retired to Liege, where he was received with the utmost honors by the Bishop Otbert and the inhabitants of the city.

The abdicated Emperor was again at the head of a powerful party. Henry of Lorraine and other princes of the Empire, incensed at his treatment, promised to meet him in arms at Liege, and there to celebrate the feast of Easter. The young Henry, intoxicated by his success, and miscalculating the strength of feeling aroused in his father's cause, himself proclaimed a Diet at Liege to expel his father from that city, and to punish those who had presumed to receive him. He rejected with scorn his father's submissive, suppliant expostulations. So mistrustful had the old man become that he was with difficulty prevailed upon to remain and keep his Easter at Liege. His friends urged the unseemliness of his holding that great festival in some wild wood or cavern. But the enemy approached; Cologne offered no resistance: there the young Emperor observed Palm Sunday in great state. He advanced to Aix-la-Chapelle, but in an attempt to cross the Maes his troops suffered a shameful defeat. He fled back to Cologne; that city



now ventured to close its gates and drove the king and the archbishop from their walls. Henry V. retired to Bonn, and there kept his Easter, but without imperial pomp.

At Worms he passed Whitsuntide, and laid Henry of Lorraine and all his father's partisans under the ban of the Empire: he summoned all the feudatories of Germany to meet at Wurzburg in July. Once more at the head of a formidable army he marched to crush the rebellion, as it was called, of his father, and to avenge the shame of his recent defeat. But Cologne had strengthened her walls and manned them with a large garrison. The city resisted with obstinate valor. Henry V. was forced to undertake a regular siege, to blockade the town, and endeavor to reduce it by famine. His army advanced towards Aix-la-Chapelle; all negotiations failed from the mutual distrust and animosity; a battle seemed inevitable which should decide the fate of the father and the son.

But Henry IV. was now beyond either the melancholy triumph over a rebellious son or the shame of defeat, and of those consequences which might have been anticipated if he had fallen again into those ruthless hands. On the 7th of August Erlembold, the faithful chamberlain of the Emperor, arrived in the camp of Henry with the diadem and sword of his father, the last ensigns of his imperial dignity. Worn out with fatigue and sorrow, Henry IV. had closed in peace his long and agitated life, his eventful reign of near fifty years. His dying prayers to his son were for forgiveness on account of these last acts of hostility, to which he had been driven by hard extremity, and the request that

Death of  
Henry.

A.D. 1056-  
1106.

his earthly remains might repose with those of his ancestors in the cathedral of Spires.

No one can know whether any gentler emotions of pity, remorse, or filial love, in the tumult of rejoicing at this unexpected success, touched the heart of the son with tender remorse. The last request was inexorably refused; the Church continued its implacable warfare with the dead. The faithful Bishop of Liege, Otbert, conveyed the body of his sovereign in decent pomp to the church of St. Lambert. His nobler partisans had dispersed on all sides; but more true mourners, widows, orphans, the whole people crowded around as though they had lost a father; they wept, they kissed his bountiful hands, they embraced his cold body; they would scarcely permit it to be let down into the grave. Nor was this mere transient sorrow; they kept watch round the sepulchre, and wept and prayed for the soul of their deceased benefactor.<sup>1</sup>

Nevertheless, haughtily regardless of this better testimony to the Christian virtues of the Emperor than all their solemn services, the bishops of the adverse party declared that he who was excommunicate in life was excommunicate in death. Otbert was compelled, as a penance for his precipitate act of gratitude and love, to disinter the body, which was placed in an unconsecrated building in an island on the Moselle. No sacred ceremonial was permitted; a single monk, just returned from Jerusalem, had the pious boldness to sing psalms beside it day and night. It was at length, by his son's permission, conveyed to Spires with a small attendance

<sup>1</sup> Even Dodechin writes: "Enimvero ut de eo omnia loquar, erat valde misericors." Having given an instance of his mercy, that he was "valde compatiens et misericors in eleemosynis pauperum."—Apud Struvium, p. 677.

of faithful servants. It was received by the people, and even the clergy, with great honor and conveyed to the cathedral. At this the implacable bishop was seized with indignation ; he imposed penance on all who had attended the procession, he prohibited the funeral service, and ordered the body to be placed in an unconsecrated chapel within the cathedral. The better Christianity of the people again rebuked the relentlessness of the bishop. They reminded him how the munificent Emperor had enriched the church of Spires ; they recounted the ornaments of gold and silver and precious stones, the silken vestments, the works of art, the golden altar-table, richly wrought, a present of the eastern Emperor Alexius, which had made their cathedral the most gorgeous and famous in Germany. They loudly expressed their grief and dissatisfaction, and were hardly restrained from tumult. But they prevailed not. Yet the bier of Henry was still visited by unbought and unfeigning witnesses to his still more Christian oblations, his boundless charities. At length after five years of obstinate contention Henry was permitted to repose in the consecrated vault with his imperial ancestors.

## CHAPTER II.

## HENRY V. AND POPE PASCHAL II.

IF it were ever unpresumptuous to trace the retributive justice of God in the destiny of one man, it might be acknowledged in the humiliation of Pope Paschal II. by the Emperor Henry V. The Pope, by his continual sanction, if not by direct advice, had trained the young Emperor in his inordinate ambition and his unscrupulous avidity for power. He had not rebuked his shameless perfidy or his revolting cruelty; he had absolved him from thrice-sworn oaths; he had released him from the great irrevocable obligations of nature and the divine law. A rebel against his sovereign and his father was not likely, against his own interests or passions, to be a dutiful son or subject of his mother the Church, or of his spiritual superiors. If Paschal suffered the result of his own lessons, if he was driven from his capital, exposed to personal sufferings so great and menacing as to compel him to submit to the hardest terms which the Emperor chose to dictate, he had not much right to compassion. Paschal is almost the only later Pope who was reduced to the degrading necessity of being disclaimed by the clergy, of being forced to retract his own impeccable decrees, of being taunted in his own day with heresy, and abandoned as a feeble traitor to the

rights of the Church by the dexterous and unscrupulous apologist of almost every act of the Papal See.

Hardly was Henry V. in peaceful possession of his father's throne when the dispute about the investitures was unavoidably renewed. The humble ally of the Church was not more inclined to concede the claims of the Teutonic sovereign than his contumacious and excommunicated father. The implacable enmity with which the Pope had pursued the older Emperor turned immediately against himself. Instead of an adversary weary of strife, worn out with premature old age, under the ignominy not only of his former humiliation at the feet of Hildebrand, but of his recent expulsion from Italy, and with almost the whole of Germany in open arms or leagued by discontent against him, Paschal had raised up an antagonist, a youth of unrivalled activity and unbridled ambition, flushed with the success of his rebellion, holding that authority over the princes of the Empire which sprang from their common engagement in a daring and unjustifiable cause, unencumbered with the guilt of having appointed the intrusive prelates, who held their sees without the papal sanction, yet sure of their support if he would maintain them in their dignities. The Empire had thus become far more formidable ; and unless it would humbly cede all the contested rights (at such a time and under such a king an event most improbable) far more hostile.

Pope Paschal held a synod chiefly of Lombard bishops at Guastalla.<sup>1</sup> The first act was to revenge the dignity of Rome against the rival see of Ravenna, which for a century had set up an Antipope.

Synod of  
Guastalla.

<sup>1</sup> Labbe et Mansi, Concil. sub ann. 1106, Oct. 18.



Already, jealous no doubt of the miracles reported by his followers to be wrought at his tomb, Paschal had commanded the body of Guibert to be taken up from its sepulchre and cast into the Tiber. The metropolitan see of Ravenna was punished by depriving it of the province *Æmilia*, and its superiority over the bishoprics of Piacenza, Parma, Reggio, Modena, and Bologna. A prudent decree, which expressed profound sorrow for the divisions in Germany, acknowledged the titles of all those prelates who had been consecrated during the schism and had received the imperial investiture, in fact of the whole episcopacy with few exceptions, in the Empire. Those alone who were usurpers, Simoniacs, or men of criminal character, were excluded from this act of amnesty. But another decree condemned the investiture by lay hands in the strongest terms, deposed the prelates who should hereafter admit, and excommunicated the laymen who should dare to exercise, this authority. Ambassadors from the young Emperor, the Bishops of Treves and Halberstadt, courteously solicited the presence of Paschal in Germany. They proposed a council to be held at Augsburg to arrange definitively the ecclesiastical affairs of the Empire, at the same time expressing their hope that the Pope would fully concede all the rights of the Empire, an ambiguous phrase full of dangerous meaning! <sup>1</sup>

The Pope acceded to the request, but the Emperor and the princes of the Empire held their Christmas at Augsburg, vainly awaiting his arrival. The Pope had

<sup>1</sup> "Quærens, ut jus sibi regni  
Concedat, sedi sanctæ cupit ipse fidelis  
Esse velut matri, subici sibi vel quasi patri."

DONIZO.

advanced as far as Verona ; a tumult in that city shook his confidence in the commanding sanctity of his presence. His more prudent counsellors suggested the unconquerable determination of the Germans to maintain the right of investiture, and the danger of placing himself in the power of a prince at once so daring and perfidious.<sup>1</sup> He would be more safe in the friendly territory and under the less doubtful protection of the King of France. The acts of Henry might justify this mistrust. The king proceeded at once to invest the Bishops of Verdun and Halberstadt, and commanded the Archbishop of Treves to consecrate them ; he reinstated the Bishop Udo, who had been deposed by the Pope, in the see of Hildesheim ; he forced an abbot who was actually under an interdict in the monastery of St. Tron to violate his suspension. The papal clergy throughout Germany quailed before these vigorous measures. So utterly were they prostrated that Gebhard of Constance, Oderic of Passau, under the specious pretence of avoiding all communion with the excommunicate, had determined to engage in a foreign pilgrimage. Paschal entreats them to remain as shining lights, and not to leave Germany a land of utter darkness.<sup>2</sup>

The tone of Henry's ambassadors, before a Council held by Pope Paschal at Troyes,<sup>3</sup> in Champagne, was as haughty and unyielding. He demanded his full privilege of electing bishops, granted, according to his assertion, by the Pope to Charlemagne.<sup>4</sup> He would not

<sup>1</sup> Chronicon Ursbergense, sub ann. 1107.

<sup>2</sup> Epist. Gebhard. Constant., &c. "Et in medio nationis prave et perverse tanquam luminaria lucere studeant." — Oct. 27, 1106.

<sup>3</sup> May 23, 1107. The Archbishop of Mentz, Rothard, refused to be present at Troyes.

<sup>4</sup> Chronicon Ursbergense, sub ann. 1107.

condescend to permit questions which related to the German Empire to be agitated in a foreign country, in France. At Rome this great cause should be decided; and a year's truce was mutually agreed upon, to allow the Emperor to make his appearance in that city.

It was not, however, till the third year after this truce that Henry descended into Italy. These years were occupied by wars in Bohemia, Hungary, and Poland. Though not always or eventually successful, the valor and determination of Henry, as well as his unscrupulous use of treachery when force failed, strengthened the general dread of his power and his ambition.

In a great Diet at Ratisbon on the Feast of the Epiphany, A.D., 1110, the Emperor announced <sup>Diet at Ratisbon. A.D. 1110.</sup> his intention of proceeding to Rome — I. For his coronation; the Pope had already expressed to the King's ambassadors his willingness to perform that ceremony, if Henry would declare himself a faithful son and protector of the Church. II. To reëstablish order in Italy. The Lombard Republics had now begun to assert their own freedom, and to wage furious battle against the freedom of their neighbors. Almost every city was at war with another; Milan with Lodi, Pavia with Tortona, Pisa with Lucca. III. To take measures for the protection of the Church in strict obedience to the Pope.<sup>1</sup> He delayed only to celebrate his betrothal with Matilda, the Infant daughter of Henry I. of England.

The summons was obeyed in every part of the Empire. Above 30,000 knights, with their at- <sup>Henry's</sup> tendants, and the infantry, assembled under <sup>army.</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Ad nutum patris apostolici."

the Imperial banner, the most formidable army which for some centuries had descended from the Alps; and to be increased by the Italian partisans of the Emperor. Large contributions were made to defray the expenses of the expedition. In order to cope with the papal party, not in arms only, but likewise in argument, he was attended by the most learned of the Transalpine ecclesiastical scholars, ready to do theological battle in his cause.<sup>1</sup> Though an angry comet glared in the heavens, yet the Empire seemed to adopt with eager loyalty this invasion of Italy.

The first act of Henry struck terror into all minds.

Henry in Italy. With a considerable division of the army, the Emperor himself descended from Savoy upon Ivrea, and reached Vercelli. Novara presumed to resist. The unfortunate town was given up to the flames, its walls razed to the ground. All the other cities of Lombardy, appalled by this example, sent their plate and large contributions in money to the Emperor. The haughty and populous Milan alone refused this mark of subjection.<sup>2</sup> The other division of the army had descended by the valley of Trent; the united forces assembled in the plains of Roncaglia, near Piacenza. The proud and politic Matilda had entertained the imperial ambassadors on their return from Rome with friendly courtesy. The Emperor knew too well her importance not to attempt to gain her neutrality, if not

<sup>1</sup> His chaplain, David the Scot, was to be the historian of the expedition. His work is lost, but was used by the author of the *Chronicon Ursbergense*, and by William of Malmesbury.

<sup>2</sup> "Aurea vasa sibi, necnon argentea misit  
Plurima, cum multis urbs omnis denique nummis.  
Nobilis urbs solum Mediolanum populosa  
Non servivit ei, nummum neque contulit æris." — DONIZO.

her support ; she was too prudent to offend a warlike sovereign at the head of such a force. She swore allegiance, and promised fealty against all enemies except the Pope. Henry confirmed her in all her possessions and privileges.

The army advanced, but suffered great losses both of horses and men from continued heavy rains in the passes of the Apennines. The strong fortress of Pontremoli followed the example and shared the fate of Novara. At Florence Henry held his Christmas, and compelled Pisa and Lucca to make a treaty of peace. Such an army as Henry's was not likely to be restrained by severe discipline, nor was Henry likely to enforce discipline, unless from policy. Of many cities he gained possession by delusive offers of peace. No person or property was treated with respect ; churches were destroyed : religious men seized and plundered, or expelled from their monasteries. In Arezzo Henry took the part of the clergy against the people, levelled the walls and fortifications, and destroyed great part of the city.<sup>1</sup>

And still his march continued unresisted and unchecked towards Rome. He advanced to Aquapendente, to Sutri. There the Pope, utterly defenceless, awaited this terrible visit. He had endeavored to prevail on his vassals, the Norman princes of Calabria and Apulia, to succor him in the hour of need ; not a knight obeyed his summons.

From the ruins of Arezzo Henry had sent forward an embassy — the Chancellor Albert, Count Henry advances on Rome. Godfrey of Calw, and other nobles, to negotiate with the Pontiff. Peter, the son of Leo, a man

<sup>1</sup> Annalist. Saxo., sub ann. 1111.



of Jewish descent, once a partisan of the Antipope Guibert, now a firm supporter of the Pope, who had extraordinary influence over the people of Rome, was called in to assist the Cardinals in their council. The dispute seemed hopelessly irreconcilable. The Pope could not cede the right of investiture, which his predecessors and himself in every Council, at Guastalla, at Troyes, still later at Benevento, and in the Lateran,<sup>1</sup> had declared to be a sacrilegious usurpation. Such an Emperor, at the head of an irresistible army, was not likely to abandon a right exercised by his ancestors in the Empire since the days of Charlemagne.

To the amazement and indignation of that age, and to the wonder of posterity,<sup>2</sup> the plain principles of right and equity began to make themselves heard. If the clergy would persist in holding large temporalities, they must hold them liable to the obligations and subordinate to the authority of the State. But if they would surrender all these fiefs, royalties, privileges, and immunities, by which they were perpetually embroiled in secular concerns, and return into their purely ecclesiastical functions, all interference of the State with the consecration of bishops became a manifest invasion on the Church. The Church must content herself with its tithes and offerings; so the clergy would be relieved from those abuses inseparable from vast temporal possessions, and in Germany in general so flagrantly injurious to the sacred character. Through their vast territorial domains, bishops and abbots were

<sup>1</sup> At Benevento, Oct. 1008; in the Lateran, 1110, March 7. *Annalist. Saxo.* apud Pertz, vi. 748. *Annal. Hildesheim.*, *ibid.* iii. 112.

<sup>2</sup> "Anchè oggi si ha pena a credere, che un pontifice arrivassi a promettere una sì smisurata concessione." — Muratori, *Ann. d'Italia*, sub ann. 1011.

not only compelled to perpetual attendance in the civil courts, but even bound to military service, by which they could scarcely escape being partakers in rapine, sacrilege, incendiarism, and homicide. The ministers of the altar had become ministers of the court. Out of this arose the so branded monstrous claim of the right of investiture, which had been justly condemned by Gregory and by Urban. Remove the cause of the evil, the evil would cease.<sup>1</sup>

Pope Paschal, either in his fear, and in the consciousness of his desperate and helpless position,<sup>2</sup> or from some secret conviction that this was the real interest of the Church, as well as the most Christian course; or anticipating the unconquerable resistance of the clergy, which would release him from the fulfilment of his part of the treaty, and throw the whole prelacy and clergy on his side, suddenly acquiesced in this basis for the treaty.<sup>3</sup> The Church surrendered all the possessions and all the royalties which it had received of the Empire and of the kingdom of Italy from the days of Charlemagne, Louis the Pious, and Henry I.; all the cities, duchies, marquisates, countships, rights of

<sup>1</sup> The Emperor recites the letter of Paschal. "*In vestri autem regni partibus episcopi vel abbates adeo curis secularibus occupantur, ut comitatum assidue frequentare, et militiam exercere cogantur, quæ nimirum aut vix aut nullo modo sine rapinis, sacrilegiis, incendiis, aut homicidiis exhibetur. Ministri vero altaris, ministri curiæ facti sunt, quia civitates, ducatus, marchionatus, monetas, turres, et cetera, ad regni servitium pertinentia a regibus acceperunt.*" — Dodechin apud Struvium, p. 669.

<sup>2</sup> He had already congratulated Henry, "*quod patris nequitiam abhorreret.*" Paschal had been perplexed to show what wickedness of his father, as regards the Church, Henry abhorred. Chron. Casin.

<sup>3</sup> There is much which is contradictory in the statements. According to the writer of the Chronicon Casinense, the treaty was concluded while Henry was still at Florence by Peter Leonis on the side of the Pope, and the ambassadors of Henry.

coining money, customs, tolls,<sup>1</sup> advocacies, rights of Feb. 12, 1111. raising soldiers, courts and castles, held of the Empire. The King, on his part, gave up the now vain and unmeaning form of Investiture.<sup>2</sup>

The treaty was concluded in the porch of St. Peter's Treaty. Church, it might seem, in the actual presence of the Apostle. The King pledged himself on the day of his coronation, in the sight of the clergy and the people, to grant the investiture of all the churches. The Pope, at the same time, was to confirm by an oath the surrender of all the royalties held by the Church. On one point alone the Pope was inflexible. Henry entreated permission to bury his father in consecrated ground. The Pope, who had already significantly reminded Henry that he had acknowledged and professed to abhor the wickedness of his father, infamous throughout the world, declared that the martyrs sternly exacted the expulsion of that guilty man from their churches; they would hold no communion in death with him who died out of communion with the Church.<sup>3</sup>

The King pressed this point no further; but he consented to swear never hereafter to intermeddle in the investiture of the churches, which clearly did not belong to the Empire, or to disturb them in the free possession of oblations or property. He was to restore and maintain to the Holy See the patrimony of St. Peter, as it had been granted by Pepin, by Charlemagne, and by Louis. He was to pledge himself neither in

<sup>1</sup> "Advocatus regum, jura centurionum."

<sup>2</sup> The first convention in Pertz, Leg. ii. 68. Eccard, ii. 270.

<sup>3</sup> "Hostis enim nequitiam, toto jam sæculo diffamatam, et interius cognosceret, et gravius abhorreret. . . . Ipsos etiam Dei Martyres jam in cœlestibus positos id terribiliter exegisse sciret, ut sceleratorum cadavera de suis Basilicis pellerentur, ut quibus viventibus non communicamus, nec mortuis communicare possumus." — Chron. Casin., cap. xxxvi.

word nor thought to injure either in life or limb, or by imprisonment by himself or others, the Pope or any of his adherents, by name Peter, the son of Leo, or his sons, who were to be hostages for the Pope. All the great princes of the Empire, among them Frederick Prince of Swabia and the Chancellor Albert, were to guarantee by oath the fulfilment of the treaty. Both sides gave hostages: the Emperor his nephew Frederick of Swabia, Bruno Bishop of Spire, and three others; the Pope the sons or kindred of Peter, the son of Leo. The Pope not only consented on these terms to perform the rite of coronation, he also pledged himself never hereafter to disturb the Emperor or the Empire on these questions; to bind his successors by an anathema not to presume to break this treaty. And Peter the son of Leo pledged himself, if the Pope should fail in his part of the contract, to espouse the cause of the Emperor, and to be his faithful vassal.

Such was the solemn compact between the two great Powers of Latin Christendom. The oaths may still be read with which it was ratified by the contracting parties.<sup>1</sup>

On Saturday, the 11th of February, Henry appeared on the Monte Mario. A deputation from the city met him, and required his oath to respect the liberties of Rome. Henry, perhaps from ignorance of the language, replied in German; a suspicion of treachery arose; the Romans withdrew in deep but silent mistrust. The hostages were exchanged on each side; Henry ratified his compact, and guaranteed to the Pope, besides the patrimony of St. Peter, that which belonged to neither, Apulia, Calabria, Sicily, and the principality of Capua

<sup>1</sup> Apud Pertz. Mansi, sub ann.

The next day (Sunday) a magnificent procession of the authorities and of the people, under their different banners, escorted the King into the city. The standards of the old Republic and the new religion were mingled together. The torchbearers, the bearers of the Cross, the Eagles, the banners emblazoned with the Lion, the Wolf, and the Dragon.<sup>1</sup> The people strewed flowers and palm-branches; all the guilds and schools marched in their array. According to usage, at two different places the Emperor took the oath to protect and maintain the franchises of the people. The Jews before the gate of the Leonine City, the Greeks in the gate itself, the whole people as he passed through the streets, welcomed him with songs and hymns and all royal honors. He dismounted from his horse, ascended the steps of St. Peter, approached the Pope, who was encircled by the cardinals, by many bishops, by the whole clergy and choir of the Church.<sup>2</sup> He kissed first the feet, and then the mouth of the Pontiff; they embraced three times, and three times in honor of the Trinity exchanged the holy kiss on the forehead, the eyes, and the lips. All without was the smoothest and most cordial harmony, but within there was profound misgiving. Henry had demanded that the gates and towers of the Vatican should be occupied by his soldiery.

The King took the right hand of the Pope; the people rent the air with acclamations. The King made his solemn declaration to observe the

Henry  
Emperor

<sup>1</sup> Annalista Saxo.

<sup>2</sup> The Chron. Casin. makes Henry mount his horse again, and as it should seem ride up the steps, for he dismounts again to greet the Pope. This is not unimportant, as the monk makes Henry hold the Pope's stirrup (*stratoris officium exhibuit*). But was the Pope on horseback?



treaty ; the Pope declared him Emperor, and again the Pope bestowed the kiss of peace. They now took their seats within the porphyry chancel.

But after all this solemn negotiation, this imposing preparation, which would trust the other ? which would first venture to make the full, the irrevocable concession ? The character of Henry justifies the darkest suspicion of his treachery, but the Pope must by this time have known that the Church would never permit him to ratify the rash and prodigal concession to which he was pledged so solemnly. All the more lofty Churchmen had heard with amazement that the successor of Hildebrand and of Urban had surrendered at once half of the dignity, more than half of the power, the independence, perhaps the wealth of the Church. The Cardinals, no doubt, as appointed by the late Popes, were mostly high Hildebrandines. Many of the Lombard bishops held rights and privileges in the cities which would have been at the least imperilled by this unlimited surrender of all royalties. But the blow was heaviest on the Transalpine prelates. The great prince bishops of Germany ceased at once to be princes ; they became but bishops. They were to yield up all their pomp, all their vast temporal power. It was the avowed design to banish them from the camp, the council, and the court, and to confine them to the cathedral. They were no longer, as holding the most magnificent imperial fiefs, to rank with the counts, and dukes, and princes ; to take the lead at the Diet ; to grant or to withhold their contingent of armed men for service under the Imperial banner ; to ride abroad with a splendid retinue ; to build not only sumptuous palaces but strong castles ; to be the

great justiciaries in their cities, to levy tolls, appoint markets and havens. Their sole occupation henceforth was to be their spiritual cure, the services in their churches, the superintendence of their dioceses: the clergy were to be their only vassals, their honor only that which they might command by their sacerdotal character, their influence that only of the chief spiritual pastor within their sees. The Pope might seem deliberately and treacherously to sacrifice all the higher ecclesiastics, to strip them remorselessly of all those accessories of outward show and temporal influence (some of the better prelates might regret the loss of that power, as disabling them from the protection of the poor against the rich, of the oppressed against the oppressor): at the same time he secured himself: to him the patrimony of St. Peter was to be confirmed in its utmost amplitude. He, and he only, was still to be independent of the tithes and oblations of the faithful; to be a sovereign, at least with all the real powers of a sovereign.

They sat, then, the Emperor and the Pope, watching each other's movements; each determined not to commit himself by some hasty word or act. The object of each was to throw upon the other the shame and obloquy of the violation of contract. Their historians have faithfully inherited their mistrust and suspicion, and cast the blame of the inevitable breach on either of the irreconcilable parties. Henry indeed is his own historian, and asserts the whole to have been a stratagem on the part of the Pope to induce him to abandon the claim to the investiture. And no doubt the advantage was so clearly on the side of the king that even some of his own seemingly most ardent adherents might dread, and might endeavor to interrupt, a

treaty which threw such immense power into his hands. Not merely was he relieved from the salutary check of the ecclesiastical feudatories, but some of the superior nobles becoming his vassals, holding directly of the Emperor instead of intermediately of the Church, were less safe from tyranny and oppression. On the other hand, it is asserted that Henry had determined never to concede the investiture — that this was one more added to his acts of perfidy and falsehood.<sup>1</sup>

At length the king withdrew into a private chamber to consult with his nobles and his prelates : among these were three Lombard bishops, of Parma, Reggio, and Piacenza. His principal adviser was the Chancellor Albert, afterwards Archbishop of Mentz, a man of daring and ambition : of the secrets of this council nothing transpired.

Time wore away. The Transalpine prelates, to remonstrate (no doubt their remonstrance deepened into expostulation, into menace), threw themselves at the feet of the Pope. Paschal, if credit is to be given to the most full and distinct account, still held the lofty religious doctrine that all should be surrendered to Cæsar which belonged to Cæsar, that the clergy should stand altogether aloof from temporal concerns.<sup>2</sup> This doctrine, it might have been supposed, would have been most acceptable to the ears of Cæsar, who had now resumed his place. But instead of the calm ratification of the treaty, the assembly became more and more tumultuous. Loud voices clamored that the treaty could not be fulfilled.<sup>3</sup> A partisan of Henry exclaimed,

<sup>1</sup> Annal. Roman., p. 474; Eccard, Chron.; Annal. Hildesheim., 1111; Pandulf. Pisan.; Chron. Casin.

<sup>2</sup> Chronic. Casin.

<sup>3</sup> The monk of Monte Casino would persuade us that this was a cry treacherously got up by the *partisans* of Henry; probably the loudest remonstrants were Transalpines.

“What need of this dispute? Our Emperor shall receive the crown as it was received by Charlemagne, by Pepin, and by Louis!” The Pope refused to proceed to the ceremony. As it grew later he proposed to adjourn the meeting. The Imperialists, as the strife grew more hot, took measures to prevent the Pope from leaving the church until he should have performed the coronation. He and the clergy were surrounded by files of soldiers; they were scarcely allowed approach to the altar to provide the elements for the Eucharist or to celebrate the evening mass. After that mass they again sat under guard before the Confessional of St. Peter, and only at nightfall were permitted, under the same strict custody, to retire into an adjacent building. Acts of violence were committed; some of the attendant boys and even the clergy were beaten and stripped of their vestments: two bishops, John of Tusculum and Leo of Ostia, made their escape in disguise.

The populace of Rome, as soon as they heard of the imprisonment of the Pope, indignant at his treatment, or at least hating the Germans, who had already given much cause for suspicion and animosity, rose in furious insurrection. They slew all the unarmed Teutons who had come up to the city for devotion or for trade. The next day they crossed the Tiber, attacked the army without the walls, and, flushed with some success, turned upon the Emperor and his troops, which occupied St. Peter's: they almost got possession of the porch of the church. The Emperor, who had mounted his horse half armed, and charged into the fray, having transfixed five Romans with his lance, was thrown from his horse and wounded in the face. A devoted adherent, Otho, a Milanese count, gave the Emperor his

horse, but was himself taken prisoner, carried into the streets and torn limb from limb : his flesh was thrown to the dogs. The Emperor shouted to his knights in a tone of bitter reproach, " Will ye leave your Emperor to be murdered by the Romans ? " The chivalrous spirit kindled at his voice ; the troops rallied ; the battle lasted till nightfall, when the Romans, having plundered the dead, turned back towards the city with their booty. But the Imperialists had now recovered from their surprise, charged the retreating enemy, and slaughtered a great number, who would not abandon their plunder to save their lives. The castle of St. Angelo alone, which was in the power of the Romans, checked the Germans and protected the passage of the river.

All that night the warlike Bishop of Tusculum<sup>1</sup> harangued the Romans, and exhorted them to rescue the Pope and the cardinals from the hands of their ungodly enemies ; he lavished on all sides his offers of absolution. Henry found it prudent after three days to withdraw from the neighborhood of Rome : his Feb. 16. army was on the wrong side of the Tiber, which lay between him and the city. He marched along the Flaminian Way towards Soracte, crossed the Tiber, and afterwards the Anio, and there joined his Italian adherents. On that side of Rome he concentrated his forces and wasted the whole territory. His prisoners, the Pope, the bishops, and the cardinals, were treated with great indignity, the Pope stripped of his robes of state, the clergy bound with ropes. The Pope, with two bishops and four cardinals, were imprisoned in the castle of Treviso ; no one of his Roman adherents was

<sup>1</sup> The Bishop of Tusculum enhances the prowess and success of the Romans. Compare his letter to the Bishop of Alba. — Labbe, p. 775.



permitted to approach him ; the other cardinals were confined in the castle of Corcodilo.

The indefatigable Bishop of Tusculum showed the utmost energy in keeping up the resistance of the Roman people. But no help could be expected from the Normans. Duke Roger and his brother Bohemond were just dead ; the Normans could only hope to protect their own territories against the advance of the Emperor. The prince of Capua made an attempt to throw 300 men into Rome ; at Ferentino he found the Count of Tusculum posted, with other Italian partisans of Henry : his troops returned to Capua.

Two months passed away.<sup>1</sup> The German army wasted the whole land with merciless cruelty up to the gates of Rome. But still the resolute Paschal refused to acquiesce in the right of investiture or to crown the Emperor. Henry is said, in his wrath, to have threatened to cut off the heads of the Pope and all the cardinals. In vain the weary and now dispirited cardinals urged that he gave up only the investiture of the royalties, not of the spiritual powers ; in vain they represented the danger of a new schism which might distract the whole Church. The miseries of his Roman subjects at length touched the heart of Paschal ; with many tears he exclaimed, "I am compelled, for the deliverance of the Church and for the sake of peace, to yield what I would never have yielded to save my own life."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The rest of February and the whole of March, with some days of April.

<sup>2</sup> "Proponetur pontifici captivorum calamitates quod amissis liberis et uxoribus domo et patriâ exules durioribus compedibus abducebantur. Proponetur Ecclesiæ Romanæ desolatio, quæ pene omnes Cardinales amiserat. Proponetur gravissimum schismatis periculum, quod pene universæ

Near Ponte Mommolo over the Anio, this treaty was ratified. The Pope surrendered to the Emperor the right of investiture over the bishops and abbots of the Empire. He promised to take no revenge for what had passed, more especially he solemnly pledged himself not to anathematize Henry, but to crown April 11, 12.

him as King, Emperor, and Patrician of Rome, and to render him all due allegiance. The king on his part covenanted to set the Pope, the cardinals, and all his other prisoners at liberty, and not to take Treaty.

them again into captivity; to make peace with the Romans and all the adherents of the Pope; to maintain the Pope in the possession of his sacred dignity, to restore all the property of which he had been despoiled, and, saving the dignity of the kingdom and of the Empire, to be obedient to the Pope as other Catholic sovereigns to other Catholic Pontiffs of Rome.

The Germans suspected that into the written treaty might furtively be introduced some protest that the Pope was under force. Count Albert Blandrade declared to Paschal that his concession must be unconditional. "If I may not add a written condition," replied the Pope, "I will do it by word." He turned to the Emperor: "So will we fulfil our oath as thou givest assurance that thou wilt fulfil thine." The Emperor could not but assent. Fourteen cardinals and ecclesiastics on the part of the Pope, fourteen

*Latinae ecclesiæ immineret. Victus tandem miseriis filiorum, laborans gravibus suspiriis et gemitibus, et in lacrymis totus effusus ecclesiæ pro liberatione ac pace hoc pati, hoc permittere, quod pro vita mea nullatenus consentirem.*" — *Annal. Roman.* p. 475. An Imperialist writer strangely compares the conduct of Henry, in thus extorting the surrender, with Jacob's wrestling for a blessing with the angel. — *Chron. Ursbergense, in loc.* Also *Annalista Saxo*.

princes of the Empire on that of Henry, guaranteed by oath the fulfilment of the treaty. The written compact menaced with the anathema of the Church all who should infringe, or contumaciously persist in infringing, this Imperial privilege. No bishop was to be consecrated till he had received investiture.

The army advanced again to Rome ; they crossed  
April 13.  
Coronation of  
the Emperor. the Salarian bridge and entered the Leonine city beyond the Tiber. With closed doors, fearful of some new tumult of the people, the Pope, in the church of St. Peter, performed the office of coronation. Both parties seemed solicitous to array the treaty in the most binding solemnities. That there might appear no compulsion, the Emperor, as soon as he had been crowned, replaced the charter of his privilege in the Pope's hand, and received it a second time, contrary to all usage, from his hands. The mass closed the ceremony ; the Pope brake the host : "As this part of the living body of the Lord is severed from the rest, so be he severed from the Church of Christ who shall violate this treaty."

A deputation of the Romans was then permitted to enter the church ; they presented the Emperor with the golden diadem, the insignia of the Patriciate and Defensorship of the city of Rome. Yet Henry did not enter, as his predecessors were wont, the unruly city ; he withdrew to his camp, having bestowed rich gifts upon the clergy and taken hostages for their fidelity : the Pope passed by the bridge over the Tiber into Rome.

The Emperor returned to Germany, having extorted in one successful campaign that which no power had been able to wring from the more stubborn Hildebrand

and Urban. So great was the terror of his name that the devout defender of the Pope and of his supremacy, the Countess Matilda, scrupled not to maintain the most friendly relations with him. She would not indeed leave her secure fortress, but the Emperor condescended to visit her at Bianello; he conversed with her in German, with which, as born in Lorraine, she was familiar, released at her request the Bishops of Parma and Reggio, called her by the endearing name of mother, and invested her in the sovereignty of the province of Liguria.

It would be unjust to Paschal not to believe him sincere in his desire to maintain this treaty, so publicly made, so solemnly ratified. But he <sup>Dissatisfaction in Rome.</sup> could no more resist the indignation of the clergy than the menaces of the Emperor. The few cardinals who had been imprisoned with him, as his accomplices, feebly defended him; all the rest with one voice called upon him immediately to annul the unholy, the sacrilegious compact; to excommunicate the Emperor who had dared to extort by violence such abandonment of her rights from the Church. The Pope, who was omnipotent and infallible to advance the authority of the Church, when he would make any concession lost at once his power and infallibility. The leader of the old Hildebrandine party, more papal than the Pope himself, was Bruno, afterwards a saint, then Bishop of Segni and abbot elect of Monte Casino. He addressed the Pope to his face: "They say that I am thine enemy; I am not thine enemy: I owe thee the love and reverence of a father. But it is written, *he who loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me.* I love thee, but I love Him more who made both me and

thee." He proceeded to denounce the treaty, to arraign the Pope for violation of the apostolic canons, for heresy. "If I do not deprive him of his Abbey," said the Pope in his bitterness, "he will deprive me of the Papacy."<sup>1</sup> The monks of Monte Casino, at the Pope's July 5. instigation, chose another abbot; and as the new abbot was supported by arms, Bruno gave up his claims and retired to his bishopric of Segni.

The oath which the Pope had taken, and ratified by such awful circumstances, embarrassed the Pope alone. The clergy, who had incurred no danger, and suffered no indignity or distress, taunted him with his weakness, contrasted his pliancy with the nobly obstinate resolution of Hildebrand and of Urban, and exhorted him to an act of perfidy and treason of which he would bear at least the chief guilt and shame. Paschal was sorely beset. He sought for reasons which might justify him to the world and to himself for breaking faith with the Emperor; he found none, except the refusal to surrender certain castles and strongholds in the papal territory, and some vague charges of ill-usage towards the hostages.<sup>2</sup> At one time he threatened to lay down his dignity and to retire as a hermit to the desert island of Pontia. At length the violent and incessant reproaches of the cardinals, and what might seem the general voice of the clergy, overpowered his honor, his conscience, his religion. In a letter to the Archbishop of Vienne, he declared

<sup>1</sup> Chronic. Casin.

<sup>2</sup> See his letter, apud Eccard, ii. 274 and 275. "Ex quo vobiscum illam, quam nostis, pactionem fecimus, non solum longius positi, sed ipsi etiam, qui circa nos sunt, cervicem adversus nos erexerunt, et intestinis bellis viscera nostra collacerant, et multo faciem nostram rubore perfundunt." — Oct. 26, 1111.



that he had acted only from compulsion, that he had yielded up the right of investiture only to save the liberties of the Church and the city of Rome from total ruin ;<sup>1</sup> he declared the whole treaty null and void, condemned it utterly, and confirmed all the strong decrees of Gregory VII. and of Urban II. When this intelligence was communicated to the Emperor, his German nobles were so indignant that the legate, had he not been protected by the Emperor, would hardly have escaped with his life.

But more was necessary than this unauthoritative letter of the wavering Pope to annul this solemn treaty, to reconcile by a decree of the Church the mind of man to this signal breach of faith and disregard of the most sacred oath.

In March (the next year) a council assembled in the Lateran Palace ; almost all the cardinals, March 18, 1112. whether bishops, priests, or abbots, were present, more than a hundred prelates, almost all Lateran Council. from the south of Italy, from the north only the Venetian patriarch, from France the Archbishops of Lyons and Vienne, from Germany none.

The Pope, by a subtle subterfuge, endeavored to reconcile his personal observance with the Equivocation of the Pope. absolute abrogation of the whole treaty. He protested that, though the Emperor had not kept faith with him, he would keep faith with the Emperor ; that he would neither disquiet him on the subject of the investitures, nor utter an anathema against him,<sup>2</sup> though

<sup>1</sup> Card. Arragon. ap. Muratori.

<sup>2</sup> "Ego eum nunquam anathematisabo, et nunquam de investituris inquietabo, porro scriptum illud, quod magnis necessitatibus coactus, non pro vitâ meâ, non pro salute aut gloriâ meâ, sed pro solis ecclesiæ necessitatibus sine fratrum consilio aut subscriptionibus feci, super quo nulla condicione,

he declared the act of surrender compulsory, and so not obligatory : his sole unadvised act, an evil act which ought by God's will to be corrected. At the same time, with consummate art, he made his profession of faith, for his act had been tainted with the odious name of heresy ; he declared his unalterable belief in the Holy Scriptures, in the statutes of the Œcumenic Councils, and, as though of equal obligation with these, in the decrees of his predecessors Gregory and Urban, decrees which asserted lay investiture to be unlawful and impious, and pronounced the layman who should confer, or the churchman who should accept such investiture, actually excommunicate. He left the Council to do that which he feared or scrupled to do. The Council proceeded to its sentence, which unequivocally cancelled and declared void, under pain of excommunication, this privilege, extorted, it was said, by the violence of Henry. The whole assembly with loud acclamations testified their assent, "Amen ! Amen ! So be it ! So be it !" <sup>1</sup>

But Henry was still within the pale of the Church, and Paschal refused so flagrantly to violate his oath, to which on this point he had been specifically pledged with the most binding distinctness. The more zealous churchmen determined to take upon themselves this act of holy vengeance. A council assembled at Vienne, under the Archbishop Guido, afterwards Pope Calixtus II. The Emperor condescended to send his ambassadors with letters, re-

Council of  
Vienne ex-  
communi-  
cates the  
Emperor.

nulla promissione constringimur ! — pravè factum confiteor, et omnino corrigi, domino præstante, desidero." — Cardin. Arragon. *loc. cit.*

<sup>1</sup> "Neque vero dici debet privilegium sed pravilegium." — Labbe et Mansi, sub ann. 1112. Acta Concilii, apud Pertz.

ceived, as he asserted, from the Pope since the decree of the Lateran Council, in which the Pope professed the utmost amity, and his desire of peace. The Council were amazed, but not disturbed or arrested in their violent course. As they considered themselves sanctioned in their meeting by the Pope, they proceeded to their decree. One metropolitan Council took upon itself to excommunicate the Emperor! They declared investiture by lay hands to be a heresy; by the power of the Holy Ghost they annulled the privilege granted by the Pope, as extorted by violence. "Henry, the King of the Germans, like another Judas, has betrayed the Pope by kissing his feet, has imprisoned him with the cardinals and other prelates, and has wrung from him by force that most impious and detestable charter; him we excommunicate, anathematize, cast out of the bosom of the Church, till he give full satisfaction." These decrees were sent to the Pope, with a significant menace, which implied great mistrust in his firmness. "If you will confirm these decrees, abstain from all intercourse, and reject all presents from that cruel tyrant, we will be your faithful sons; if not, so God be propitious to us, you will compel us to renounce all subjection and obedience."<sup>1</sup>

To this more than papal power the Pope submitted; he ratified the decree of the Council of Vi-  
Oct. 20.  
 enne, thus doing by others what he was solemnly sworn not to do himself; allowing what was usually supposed an inferior tribunal to dispense with the oath which he dared not himself retract; by an unworthy sophistry

<sup>1</sup> Letter of Archbishop of Vienne, and the account of the Council, apud Labbe et Mansi, A.D. 1112.

trying to obtain the advantage without the guilt of perjury.<sup>1</sup>

But these things were not done without strong remonstrance, and that from the clergy of France. A protest was issued, written by the learned Ivo of Chartres, and adopted by the Archbishop of Sens and his clergy, denying the temporal claim to the investitures to be heresy, and disclaiming all concurrence in these audacious proceedings.<sup>2</sup>

A good and prudent Emperor might have defied an interdict issued by less than the Pope. But the man who had attained his sovereignty by such violent and unjustifiable means was not likely to exercise it with justice and moderation. He who neither respected the authority nor even the sacred person of his father and Emperor, nor the more sacred person of the Pope, would trample under foot, if in his way, the more vulgar rights of vassals or of subjects. Henry condescended indeed to attempt a reconciliation with his father's friends, to efface the memory of his ingratitude by tardy piety. He celebrated with a mockery of splendor the funeral of his father (he had wrung at length the unwilling sanction of the Pope) in the cathedral of Spire; he bestowed munificent endowments and immunities on that church. The city of Worms was rewarded by special privileges for her long-tried attachment to the Emperor Henry IV., an attachment which, if it could be transferred, might be equally necessary to his son. For while Henry V. aspired to rule as a despot, he soon discovered that he wanted despotic power; he found that the

Discontent  
and revolt  
of the  
German  
prelates.

who had attained his sovereignty by such violent and unjustifiable means was not likely to exercise it with justice and moderation.

<sup>1</sup> Mansi. Bouquet, xv. 52.

<sup>2</sup> Apud Labbe et Mansi, sub ann. 1112.

habit of rebellion, which he had encouraged for his own ends, would be constantly recoiling against himself. His reign was almost one long civil war. Prince after prince, either alienated by his pride or by some violent invasion of their rights, the seizure and sequestration of their fiefs, or interference with their succession, raised the standard of revolt. Instead of reconciling the ecclesiastical princes and prelates by a temperate and generous use of the right of investiture, he betrayed, or was thought to betray, his determination to reannex as much of the ecclesiastical domains as he could to the Empire. The excommunication was at once a ready justification for the revolt of the great ecclesiastical vassals of the Empire, and a formidable weapon in their hands. From the first his acts had been held in detestation by some of the Transalpine prelates. Gerard, Archbishop of Salzburg, had openly condemned him; the holy Conrad retired into the desert, where he proclaimed his horror of such deeds. The monks of Hirschau, as their enemies the monks of Laurisheim declared, spoke of the Emperor as an excommunicated heretic. The Archbishop of Cologne almost alone defied the whole force of Henry, repelled his troops, and gradually drew into one party the great body of malecontents. Almost the whole clergy by degrees threw themselves into the papal faction. The Legates of the Pope, of their own authority it is true, and without the express sanction of the Pope, disseminated and even published the act of excommunication in many quarters. It was renewed in a synod at Beauvais, with the sanction of the metropolitan; it was formally pronounced in the church of St. Geryon at Cologne. The inhabitants of Mentz, though imperial-



ists at heart, rose in insurrection, and compelled the Emperor to release their archbishop Albert, once Henry's most faithful partisan, his counsellor throughout all the strong proceedings against Pope Paschal in Italy, but now having been raised to the German primacy by Henry's influence, his mortal enemy.<sup>1</sup> Albert had been thrown into prison on a charge of high treason; he was worn to a skeleton by his confinement. He became an object of profound compassion to all the enemies of Henry; his bitter and powerful mind devoted itself to revenge. Erlang, Bishop of Wurtzburg, of whose fidelity Henry thought himself secure, was sent to negotiate with the revolted princes and prelates, and fell off at once to the papal party.

While half Germany was thus at open war with the Emperor, the death of the great Countess Matilda imperiously required his presence in Italy. If the Pope obtained peaceable possession of her vast inheritance, which by formal instruments she had made over on her death to the Apostolical See, the Pontiff became a kind of king in Italy. The Emperor immediately announced his claim not only to all the Imperial fiefs, to the march of Tuscany, to Mantua and other cities, but to all the allodial and patrimonial inheritance held by the Countess;<sup>2</sup> and thus sprung up a new subject of irreconcilable strife between the Popes

Death of  
Countess  
Matilda.  
July 24,  
1115.

<sup>1</sup> The Pope urged his release; his only fault had been too great love for Henry. "*Quantum novimus, quantum experti sumus, testimonium fecimus, quia te super omnia diligebat.*" — Epist. Paschal, apud Eccard, ii. 276. Mansi, sub ann. 1113.

<sup>2</sup> Muratori suggests that the Emperor put forward the claim of the house of Bavaria, insisting that they were settled on Duke Guelf the younger, on his marriage. This claim was acknowledged afterwards by the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa.

and Emperors. Henry expressed his determination to cross the Alps in the course of the following year.

At Rome the preparations of Henry for his second descent into Italy were heard by some with apprehension, by some with a fierce determination to encounter, or even to provoke his worst hostility in defence of the rights of the Church. Early in the spring which was to behold this descent, a Council was summoned in the Lateran. The clergy awaited in jealous impatience, the Hildebrandine party

Lateran  
Council.  
March 6,  
1116.

mistrusting the courage of the Pope to defy the Emperor, the more moderate doubting his firmness to resist their more violent brethren. As yet the great momentous question was not proposed. There was first a preliminary one, too important, even in the present state of affairs, not to receive due attention ; it related to the Archbishopric of Milan. Grossolano, a man of learning and moderation, had been elected to that metropolitan see ; he had taken the cross and gone to the Holy Land. During his absence the clergy of Milan had, on some charge of simoniacal proceeding (he may not have been so austere as they might wish to the old unextinguished faction of the married clergy), or, as it is alleged, because he had been uncanonically translated from the see of Savona, declared him to have forfeited his see. They proceeded to elect A.D. 1112.

Giordano, represented, by no friendly writer, as a man without education (perhaps of the monastic school) and of no great weight. Giordano had been consecrated by three suffragans : Landolf Bishop of Asti, who attempted to fly, but was brought back and compelled to perform the office ; Arialdo Bishop of Genoa ; and Mamardo Bishop of Turin. Mamardo hastened to

Rome to demand the metropolitan pall for Giordano. The Archiepiscopate of Milan was of too great dignity and influence not to be secured at any cost for the high party. The Pope abandoned unheard the cause of Grossolano, and sent the pall to Giordano, but he was not to be arrayed in it till he had sworn fidelity to the Pope, and sworn to refuse investiture from the Emperor. For six months Giordano steadfastly declined to receive the pall on these terms. A large part of the people of Milan were still in favor of Grossolano, and seemed determined to proceed to extremities in his favor. The Bishops Azzo of Acqui, and Arderic of Lodi, strong Imperialists, took up the cause of Grossolano. Already was Giordano's determination shaken; when Grossolano, on his return from the Holy Land, having found his see occupied, nevertheless entered Milan. His partisans seized the towers of the Roman Gate; Giordano at once submitted to the Papal terms; and, arrayed in the pall, proclaimed himself Archbishop on the authority of the Pope. After some strife, and not without bloodshed of the people, and even of the

A.D. 1113. nobles, Grossolano was driven from Milan; he was glad to accept of terms of peace, and even pecuniary aid (the exhaustion of his funds may account for his discomfiture), from his rival; he retired first to Piacenza, afterwards to Rome, to submit to the decision of the Pope.<sup>1</sup>

But this great cause was first mooted in the Council

A.D. 1116. of Lateran. There could be no doubt for which Archbishop of Milan — one who had sworn not to accept investiture from the Emperor, or one at least suspected of Imperialist views — it would declare.

<sup>1</sup> Eccard, *Chronic.* Landulf junior, apud Muratori S. II. T. V. sub ann.

Giordano triumphed ; and, whether as part of the price stipulated for the judgment, or in gratitude and bold zeal for the cause which he had espoused, he returned rapidly to Milan. Henry was on the crest of the Alps above him ; yet Giordano dared, with the Roman Cardinal John of Cremona, to publish from the pulpit of the principal church, the excommunication of the Emperor. Even this affair of Milan, important as it was, had hardly commanded the attention of the Lateran Council. But when, after this had been despatched, some other questions were proposed concerning certain disputes between the Bishops of Pisa and Lucca, they would no longer brook delay, a Bishop sprang up and exclaimed, “ What have we to do with these temporal matters, when the highest interests of the Church are in peril ? ”<sup>1</sup> The Pope arose ; he reverted, in few words, to his imprisonment, and to the crimes and cruelties to which the Roman people had been exposed at the time of his concession. “ What I did, I did to deliver the Church and people of God from those evils. I did it as a man who am dust and ashes. I confess that I did wrong : I entreat you, offer your prayers to God to pardon me. That writing signed in the camp of the King, justly called an unrighteous decree, I condemn with a perpetual anathema. Be its memory accursed forever ! ”<sup>2</sup> The Council shouted their acclamation. The loudest voice was that of Bruno, the Bishop of Segni — “ Give thanks to God that our Lord Pope Paschal condemns with his own March 8. mouth his unrighteous and heretical decree.” In his

<sup>1</sup> It was rumored in Germany that the Council had determined to depose Paschal, if he refused to revoke the Emperor's charter of investiture.

<sup>2</sup> Ursbergensis, and Labbe and Mansi sub ann.

bitter triumph he added, "He that uttered heresy is a heretic." "What!" exclaimed John of Gaeta, "dost thou presume in our presence to call the Roman Pontiff a heretic? What he did was wrong, but it was no heresy." "It was done," said another Bishop, "to deliver the people." The Pope interposed with calm dignity: he commanded silence by his gesture. "Give ear, my brethren; this Church has never yielded to heresy. It has crushed all heresies — Arian, Eutychian, Sabellian, Photinian. For our Lord himself said, in the hour of his Passion, I have prayed for thee, O Peter, that thy faith fail not."

But the strife was not over. On the following day, Paschal, with his more moderate counsellors, John of Gaeta and Peter the son of Leo, began to enter into negotiations with the Ambassador of Henry, Pontius Abbot of Clugny. The majesty of the Papal presence could not subdue the indignant murmurs of the more Papal party, who insisted on the Church holding all its endowments, whether fiefs of the temporal power or not, absolutely and without control.

At length Conon, Cardinal of Præneste, broke out, and demanded whether the Pope acknowledged him to have been his legate in Germany, and would ratify all that he had done as legate. The Pope acknowledged him in these terms: "What you have approved, I have approved; what you have condemned, I have condemned." Conon then declared that he had first in Jerusalem, and afterwards five times, in five councils, in Greece, in Hungary, in Saxony, in Lorraine, in France, excommunicated the Emperor. The same, as appeared from his letters, had been done by the Archbishop at Vienne. That excommunication

Paschal  
afraid of his  
own act.

Conon,  
Cardinal of  
Præneste.



was now therefore confirmed by the Pope, and became his act. A feeble murmur of dissent soon died away ; the Pope kept silence.

But Paschal's troubles increased. If the Emperor should again appear before Rome, in indignation at the broken treaty, and, by temperament and habit, little disposed to be scrupulous in his measures against an enemy whom treaties could not bind, his only hope of resistance was in the attachment of the Roman people. That attachment was weakened at this unlucky moment by unforeseen circumstances. The Prefect of Rome died, and Paschal was persuaded to appoint the son of Peter Leonis to that office. The indelible taint of his Jewish descent, and his Jewish wealth, made Peter an object of envy and unpopularity. The vulgar called him a Jew, an usurer — equivalent titles of hatred. The people chose the son of the late Prefect, a boy, and presented him to the Pope for his confirmation. On the Pope's refusal, tumults broke out in all the city ; skirmishes took place between the populace and the soldiers of the Pope during the Holy Week. The young Prefect was taken in the country by the Pope's soldiers, and rescued by his uncle, the Count Ptolemy. The contest thus spread into the country. The whole territory of Rome, the coast, Rome itself, was in open rebellion. The Pope was so alarmed that he retired to Sezza. The populace revenged themselves on the houses of Peter Leonis and those of his adherents.

The Emperor had passed the Alps ; he was received in Venice by the Doge Ordelaſſo Faliero with March 29. loyal magnificence. Some of the other great cities of Lombardy followed the example. The Emperor had

taken peaceable possession of the territories of the  
Henry in Countess Matilda: neither then, nor dur-  
Italy. ing his lifetime, did the Pope or his suc-  
April 3. cessors contest his title. Italy could not but await  
with anxious apprehension the crisis of this second,  
perhaps personal strife between the Emperor and  
the Pope. But the year passed away without any at-  
tack on Rome. The Emperor was engaged in the af-  
fairs of Tuscany; the Pope by the rebellion of Rome.  
Early in the following year terrible convulsions of  
nature seemed to portend dire calamities. Earthquakes  
shook Venice, Verona, Parma, and Cremona; the  
Cathedral of Cremona, with many churches and  
stately buildings, were in ruins, and many lives lost.  
Awful storms seemed to join with civil commotions to  
distract and desolate Germany.

The Ambassadors of Henry, the Bishops of Asti, Piacenza, and Acqui, appeared at Rome, to which Paschal had returned after the cessation of the civil commotions, with a public declaration, that if any one should accuse the Emperor of having violated his part of the treaty with the Pope, he was ready to justify himself, and if guilty, to give satisfaction. He demanded the abrogation of the interdict. The Pope, it is said, with the concurrence of the Cardinals, declared that he had not sent the Cardinals Conon and Theodoric to Cologne or to Saxony; that he had given no authority to the Archbishop of Vienne to excommunicate the Emperor; that he had himself pronounced no excommunication; but he could not annul an excommunication pronounced by such dignified ecclesiastics without their consent. A general Council of the Church could alone decide the question. Henry had

too many enemies in the Church of Germany as well as Rome to submit to such a tribunal.

A second time Henry V. advanced towards Rome, but this second time under very different cir- A.D. 1117.  
cumstances. He was no longer the young and successful Emperor with the whole of Germany united in his cause, and with an army of overwhelming numbers and force at his command. But with his circumstances he had learned to change his policy. He had discovered how to contest Rome with the Pope. He had the Prefect in his pay; he lavished gifts upon the nobles; he established his partisan Ptolemy, the Count of Tusculum, in all the old possessions and rights of that house, so long the tyrant, at one time the awarder, of the Papal tiara, gave him his natural daughter in marriage, and so established a formidable enemy to the Pope and a powerful adherent of the Emperor, within the neighborhood, within the city itself. There was no opposition to his approach, to his entrance into Rome. He passed through the streets with his Empress, the people received him with acclamations, the clergy alone stood aloof in jealous silence. The Pope had retired, first to Monte Casino, then to March 16. Benevento, to implore, but in vain, the aid of the Normans. The Cardinals made an offer of peace if Henry would surrender the right of investiture by the ring and staff; but as on this point the whole imperial authority seemed at that time to depend, the terms were rejected. No one but a foreign prelate,<sup>1</sup> Burdinus, the Archbishop of Braga,<sup>2</sup> who had been Legate of Pope

<sup>1</sup> The Abbot of Farfa was a strong Imperialist.

<sup>2</sup> Baluzius (*Miscellanea*, vol. iii.) wrote a life of Burdinus, to vindicate his memory from the sweeping censure of Baronius, with whom an Anti-

Paschal to Henry, and had been dazzled or won to the Imperial party, could be tempted to officiate in the great Easter ceremony, in which the Emperor was accustomed to take off his crown in the Vatican, to make a procession through the city, and to receive it again from the hands of the Pontiff.<sup>1</sup>

But no steps were taken to approximate the hostile powers. The Emperor remained in undisturbed possession of Rome; the Pope in his safe city of refuge in the south of Italy; from hence he fulminated an excommunication against the Archbishop of Braga. As the summer heats approached, the Emperor retired to the north of Italy.

Paschal was never again master of Rome. In the  
Jan. 6. 1118. autumn he fell ill at Anagni, recovered, and  
Death of  
Paschal II. early in the following year surprised the Leonine city and the Vatican. But Peter the Prefect and the Count of Tusculum still occupied the strong-

pope was always a monster of iniquity. Maurice Bourdin was a Frenchman of the diocese of Limoges. When Bernard, Archbishop of Toledo, went to the Council of Clermont, he was struck with the learning and ability of the young French monk, and carried him back with him to Spain. Bourdin became successively Bishop of Coimbra and Archbishop of Braga. While Bishop of Coimbra he went to the Holy Land, and passed three years in the East, in Jerusalem and Constantinople. On his return he was involved in a contest with his patron Bernard, resisting the claims of the archbishopric of Toledo to supremacy over the metropolitan see of Braga. There is a decree of Pope Paschal favorable to Maurice, acknowledging his jurisdiction over Coimbra. He was at present in Rome, in order, according to Baronius, to supplant his patron Bernard, who had been expelled from his see by Alfonso of Arragon. He was scornfully rejected by Paschal, of whom he became the deadly enemy. This, as Baluzius repeatedly shows, is directly contradicted by the dates; for after this Paschal employed Maurice Burdin as his Legate to the Emperor.

<sup>1</sup> Henry had been already crowned by Paschal: this second coronation is probably to be explained as in the text; though some writers speak of it as his first coronation. Muratori says that he desired "*di farsi coronare di nuovo.*" — Sub ann. 1017.

holds of the city. Paschal died in the Castle of St. Angelo, solemnly commending to the cardinals that firmness in the assertion of the claims of the Church which he alone had not displayed. He died leaving a great lesson to future Pontiffs, that there was no limit to which they might not advance their pretensions for the aggrandizement of the hierarchy, but to retract the least of these pretensions was beyond their otherwise illimitable power. The Imperialists made no opposition to the burial of Paschal II. in a great mausoleum in the Lateran Church. The Cardinals, in the utmost haste, before the intelligence could reach the Emperor, proceeded to fill the vacant See. John of Gaeta, though he had defended the Pope from the unseemly reproach of St. Bruno, and at one time appeared inclined to negotiate with the Emperor, seems to have commanded the confidence of the high party; he was of noble descent; the counsellor of more than one Pope, and had been a faithful partisan of Pope Urban against the Antipope Guibert; he had adhered in all his distresses to Paschal, and had shared his imprisonment. He was summoned from Monte Cassino secretly, and without any notice chosen Pope by the Cardinals and some distinguished Romans, and inaugurated in a Benedictine monastery near the Capitol.

The news reached the neighboring house of Cencius Frangipani (this great family henceforward appears mingled in all the contests and intrigues of Rome), a strong partisan of the Emperor. In a sudden access of indignation he broke with his armed followers into the church, seized the Pope by the throat, struck him with his fists, trampled

Seized by  
the Frangi-  
pani.  
Jan. 24.



upon him, and dragged him a prisoner and in chains to his own strong house. All the Cardinals were miserably maltreated; the more fortunate took to flight; some were seized and put into irons. But this atrocious act rekindled all the more generous sympathies of the Roman people towards the Pope. Both parties united in his rescue. Peter the Prefect and Peter the son of Leo, the captain of the Norman troops, who had accompanied Paschal to Rome, the Transteverines, and the twelve quarters of the city, assembled under their leaders; they marched towards the Capitol and summoned Frangipani to surrender the person of the Pope. Frangipani could not but submit; he threw himself at the Pope's feet, and entreated his forgiveness. Mounting a horse, the Pope rode to the Lateran, surrounded by the banners of the people, and took possession of the papal palace. There he received the submission of the laity and of the clergy. The friends of the new Pope were quietly making arrangements for his ordination as a presbyter (as yet he was but a deacon), and his consecration as Pope. On a sudden, in the night, intelligence arrived that the Emperor had not merely set off from the north of Italy, but was actually in Rome, and master of the portico of St. Peter's. The Pope was concealed for the night in the house of a faithful partisan. In the morning he embarked on the

March 1. Tiber, but a terrible storm came on; the German soldiers watched the banks of the river, and hurled burning javelins at the vessel. At nightfall, the Germans having withdrawn, the fugitives landed, and the Pope was carried on the shoulders of Cardinal Ugo to the castle of Ardea. The next day the German soldiers appeared again, but the followers of the

Pope swearing that he had escaped, they dispersed in search of him. He was again conveyed to the vessel, and after a perilous voyage of four days, March 9. reached Gaeta, his native town. There he was ordained Presbyter, and consecrated Pope.

Henry endeavored by repeated embassies to persuade Gelasius II., such was the name assumed by the new Pope, to return to Rome; but Gelasius had been a fellow-prisoner with Pope Paschal, and had too much prudence to trust himself in the Emperor's power.<sup>1</sup> He met cunning with cunning; he offered to hold a council to decide on all matters in dispute, either in Milan or in Cremona, cities in which the papal interest now prevailed, or which were in open revolt against the Emperor. This proposal was equally offensive to the Emperor and to the Roman people. "What," was the indignant cry, "is Rome to be deserted for Milan or Cremona?" They determined to set up an Antipope; yet none appeared but Burdinus, now called Maurice the Portuguese, the Archbishop of Braga.<sup>2</sup> This stranger was led to the high altar of St. Peter's by the Emperor; and it was thrice proclaimed March 8. to the people, "Will ye have Maurice for Pope?" and thrice the people answered, "We will." The Barbarian, as he was called by his adversaries, took the name of Gregory VIII. Of the Roman clergy only three adherents of the old unextinguished Ghibeline party, Romanus Cardinal of St. Marcellus, Cencius of St. Chrysogonus, and Teuzo, who had been long in

<sup>1</sup> Epist. Gelas. II. apud Labbe, Concil. Ann. 1118.

<sup>2</sup> The famous Irnerius of Bologna, the restorer of the Roman law, was in Rome; the form of election was supposed to be regulated by his legal advice.

Denmark, sanctioned this election. He was put in possession of the Lateran palace, and the next day performed the papal functions in St. Peter's.

No sooner did Gelasius hear this than he thundered his sentence of excommunication against the perjurer Maurice, who had compelled his mother the Church to public prostitution.<sup>1</sup> Now, however, his Norman vassals, as they acknowledged themselves, William, Duke of Apulia, and Robert, Prince of Capua, obeyed his summons; under their protection he returned towards Rome. Henry, who was besieging the papal castle Toricella, abandoned the siege, and retired on Rome. But almost immediately his presence was imperiously required in Germany, and he withdrew to the north of Italy. Thence, leaving the Empress as Regent in April 7. Italy, he crossed the Alps. Gelasius had already at Capua involved the Emperor in the common excommunication with the Antipope. Some misunderstanding arose between the Norman princes and the Pope;<sup>2</sup> they withdrew, and he could now only bribe his way back to Rome.

Gelasius entered Rome as a pilgrim rather than its master. He was concealed rather than hospitably entertained by Stephen the Norman, by Paschal his brother, and Peter with the ill-sounding name of the Robber, a Corsican.<sup>3</sup> Thus were there again two Popes in the city, one maintained in state by the gold of the Emperor, the other by his own. But Gelasius in an imprudent hour ventured beyond the

<sup>1</sup> "Matris Ecclesiæ constupratorem publico." — Gelasii, Epist. ii.

<sup>2</sup> It seemed to relate to the Circeæ arx, which the Pope having granted to the people of Terracina, repented of his rashness. — Vit. Gelas.

<sup>3</sup> Latro Corsorum.

secure quarters of the Norman. He stole out to celebrate mass in the church of St. Praxedes, in a part of the city commanded by the Frangipani. The church was attacked; a scene of fearful confusion followed; the Normans, under the Pope's nephew Crescentius, fought valiantly, and rescued him from the enemy. The Frangipani were furious at their disappointment, but when they found the Pope had escaped, withdrew. "O what a sight," writes a sad eye-witness,<sup>1</sup> "to see the Pope, half clad in his sacred vestments, flying, like a mountebank,<sup>2</sup> as fast as his horse could gallop!" — his cross-bearer followed; he fell; the cross, which it might seem that his enemies sought as a trophy, was picked up and concealed by a woman. The Pope himself was found, weary, sorrowful, and moaning<sup>3</sup> with grief, in a field near the Church of St. Paul. The next day he declared his resolution to leave this Sodom, this Egypt; it were better to have to deal with one Emperor than with many tyrants. He reached Pisa, Genoa, Marseilles; but he entered France Jan. 29, 1119. only to die. Death of After visiting several of the Gelasius. great cities of the realm, Montpellier, Avignon, Orange, Valence, Vienne, Lyons, a sudden attack of pleurisy carried him off in the abbey of Clugny.

<sup>1</sup> See the letter of Bruno of Treves, in Hontheim, *Hist. Trevir.* Pandulph Pisan., p. 397.

<sup>2</sup> Sicut scurra.

<sup>3</sup> His follower says, "ejulans."

## CHAPTER III.

## CALIXTUS II.—CONCORDAT OF WORMS.

THE cardinals in France could not hesitate an instant in their choice of his successor. Calixtus II.  
Feb. 2, 1119. Gelasius had turned his thoughts to the Bishop of Palestrina, but Otho excused himself on account of his feeble health. Exiles from Rome in the cause of the Church, and through the hostility of the Emperor and his partisans, the Conclave saw among them the prelate who had boldly taken the lead in the excommunication of Henry; and who to his zeal for the Church added every other qualification for the supreme Pontificate. Guido, Archbishop of Vienne, was of more than noble, of royal birth, descended from the Kings of Burgundy, and so allied by blood to the Emperor; his reputation was high for piety and the learning of the age. But Guido, either from conscientious scruples, or in politic deference to the dominant opinion, refused to become the Pontiff of Rome without the assent of Rome. Messengers were speedily despatched and speedily returned with the confirmation of his election by the cardinals who remained at Rome, by Peter the son of Leo, by the prefect and consuls, by the clergy and people of Rome. It appears not how this assent was obtained in the presence of the Imperial garrison and the Antipope. Rome may have already become weary



or ashamed of her foreign prelate, unconnected with the great families or interests of the city ; but it is more probable that it was the assent only of the high papal party, who still, under the guidance of Peter the son of Leo, held part of the city.

Germany had furnished a line of pious, and, on the whole, high-minded Pontiffs to the Roman <sup>Calixtus</sup> see. Calixtus II., though by no means the <sup>a French</sup> Pope. first Frenchman, either by birth or education, was the first French Pontiff who established that close connection between France (the modern kingdom of France as distinguished from the Imperial or German France of Pepin and Charlemagne) and the papacy, which had such important influence on the affairs of the Church and of Europe. From this period, of the two great kingdoms into which the Empire of Charlemagne had resolved itself, the Pope, who succeeded eventually in establishing his title, was usually connected with France, and maintained by the French interest ; the Antipope by that of Germany. The anti-Imperialist republics of Italy were the Pope's natural allies against the Imperial power. For a time Innocent III. held his impartial authority over both realms, and acknowledged in turn the king of each country ; but as time advanced, the Popes were more under the necessity of leaning on Transalpine aid, until the secession to Avignon almost reduced the chief Pontiff of Christendom to a French prelate.

Christendom could scarcely expect that during the pontificate of so inflexible an assertor of its claims, and during the reign of an Emperor so resolute to maintain his rights, the strife about the Investitures should be brought to a peaceful close with the absolute triumph

of neither party, and on principles of mutual concession. Nor was the first attempt at reconciliation, which appeared to end in a more irreparable breach, of favorable augury to the establishment of unity. Yet many circumstances combined to bring about this final peace. The removal of the scene of strife into France could not but show that the contest was not absolutely necessary. The quarrel had not spread into France, though the feudal system prevailed there to the same if not greater extent. In France had been found no great difficulty in reconciling the free election of the bishops with their allegiance in temporal concerns to their sovereign. The princes of Germany began to discover that it was a question of the Empire, not of the Emperor. When in revolt, and some of them were always in revolt, the alliance of the clergy, and the popularity which their cause acquired by being upheld against an excommunicated sovereign, had blinded them at first. They were firm allies of the Pope, only because they were implacable enemies of the Emperor. The long controversy had partly wearied, partly exhausted men's minds. Some moderate views by prelates of authority and learning and of undoubted churchmanship had made strong impression. Hildebrand's vast plan of rendering the clergy altogether independent of the temporal power, not merely in their spiritual functions, but in all the possessions which they then held or might hereafter obtain, and thereby becoming the rulers of the world, was perhaps imperfectly understood by some of the most ambitious, and deliberately rejected by some zealous but less worldly ecclesiastics.

At first the aspect of affairs was singularly unpromising; the contending parties seemed to draw together

only to repel each other with more hostile violence. The immediate recognition of Calixtus by the great German prelates, not his enemies alone but his adherents also, warned Henry of the now formidable antagonist arisen in the new Pope. Henry himself, by treating with Calixtus, acknowledged his supremacy, and so abandoned his own unhappy pageant, the Archbishop of Braga, to his fate.

Calixtus summoned a council at Rheims, and never did Pope, in Rome itself, in the time of the world's most prostrate submission, make a more imposing display of power, issue his commands with more undoubting confidence to Christendom, receive, like a feudal monarch, the appeals of contending kings ; and, if he condescended to negotiate with the Emperor, maintain a loftier position than this first great French Pontiff. The Norman chronicler beheld in this august assembly an image of the day of judgment.<sup>1</sup> The Pope's consistorial throne was placed before the portal of the great church ; just below him sat the cardinals, whom the annalist dignifies with the appellation of the Roman Senate. Fifteen archbishops, above two hundred bishops, and numerous abbots and other ecclesiastical dignitaries, were present ; Albert of Mentz was attended by seven bishops, and guarded by five hundred armed men.

The first part of the proceedings might seem singularly in accordance with true pacific Christianity. After some canons on simony, some touching lay investitures and the marriage of the clergy, had been enacted in the usual form and spirit, the Pope renewed in the strongest language the Truce of God, which had been pro-

<sup>1</sup> Orderic. Vital., i. 726 ; Mansi, sub ann.

claimed by Urban II. At certain periods, from the Advent of the Lord to the Octave of the Epiphany; from Quinquagesima to Pentecost, and on certain other fasts and festivals, war was to cease throughout Christendom. At all times the Church took under its protection and commanded peace to be observed towards monks and their property, females and their attendants, merchants, *hunters*, and pilgrims. The chaplains in the army were to discountenance plunder under severe penalties. The violators of the Truce of God were to be excommunicated every Sunday in every parish church: unless they made satisfaction, by themselves or by their kindred, were to be held unworthy of Christian burial.<sup>1</sup>

The King of France, Louis the Fat, appeared in person with his barons, and, as before a supreme tribunal, himself preferred his complaint against Henry I. King of England. His complaint related to no ecclesiastical matters; he accused King Henry of refusing the allegiance due from the Duke of Normandy to the King of France, of imprisoning his own brother Robert, the rightful Duke of Normandy, of many acts of hostility and persecution against the subjects of France. Geoffrey, Archbishop of Rouen, rose to defend King Henry. But the fierce tumult which broke out from the more numerous partisans of France compelled him to silence.

After the Countess of Poitou had brought a charge against her husband of deserting her and marrying another wife, there arose a new dispute between the Franks and Normans concerning the bishopric of Ev-

<sup>1</sup> Labbe, p. 684. Datt. de Treugâ Dei in Volum. Rer. German. Ulm, 1698. Ducange in voce "*Treuga*."

reux. Audoin, the bearded bishop of Evreux, accused Amalric of expelling him from his see, and burning his episcopal palace. The chaplain of Amalric stood up and boldly replied, "It is thine own wickedness, not the injustice of Amalric, which has driven thee from thy see and burned thy palace. Amalric, disinherited by the King through thy malignant perfidy, like a true Norman warrior, strong in his own valor and in his friends, won back his honors. Then the King besieged the city, and during the siege the bishop's palace and several of the churches were burned. Let the synod judge between Audoin and Amalric."

The strife between the French and the Normans was hardly appeased by the Pope himself. Calixtus delivered a long address on the blessings of peace, on the evils of war, war alike fatal to human happiness and to religion. But these beautiful and parental sentiments were jealously reserved for the faithful sons of the Church. Where the interests of the Church were involved, war, even civil war, lost all its horrors. The Pope broke off the council for a few days, to meet the Emperor, who had expressed his earnest desire for peace, and had apparently conceded the great point in dispute. It was no doubt thought a great act of condescension as well as of courage in the

Interview  
with the  
Emperor.

Pope to advance to meet the Emperor. The character of Henry might justify the worst suspicions. He was found encamped at the head of 30,000 men. The seizure and imprisonment of Paschal was too recent in the remembrance of the Pope's adherents not to excite a reasonable apprehension. Henry had never hesitated at any act of treachery to compass his ends; would he hesitate even on the borders of France? The Pope was



Oct. 23. 25. safely lodged in the strong castle of Moisson ; his commissioners proceeded alone to the conference.

Their mission was only to give and to receive the final ratification of a treaty, already consigned to writing. Henry had been persuaded, in an interview with the Bishop of Châlons and Abbot Pontius of Clugny, that he might surrender the investiture with the ring and the pastoral staff. That form of investiture (argued the Bishop of Châlons) had never prevailed in France, yet as Bishop he had always discharged all the temporal claims of the sovereign, tribute, military service, tolls, and the other rightful demands of the State, as faithfully as the bishops of Germany, to whose investiture the Emperor was maintaining this right at the price of excommunication. "If this be so," replied the Emperor, with uplifted hands, "I require no more." The Bishop then offered his mediation on the condition that Henry should give up the usage of investitures, surrender the possession of the churches which he still retained, and consent to peace with all his enemies. Henry agreed to these terms, which were signed on the part of the Emperor by the Bishop of Lausanne, the Count Palatine, and other German magnates. The Pope on this intelligence could not but suspect the ready compliance of the Emperor ; the Bishop of Ostia and the Cardinal Gregory were sent formally to conclude the treaty. They met the Emperor between Metz and Verdun, and drew up the following Concordat : — Henry surrendered the investiture of all churches, made peace with all who had been involved in war for the cause of the Church, promised to restore all the churches which he had in his possession, and to procure the restoration of those which had been granted

to others. All ecclesiastical disputes were to be settled by the ecclesiastical laws, the temporal by the temporal judges. The Pope on his side pledged himself to make peace with the Emperor and with all his partisans ; to make restitution on his part of everything gained in the war. These terms by the Pope's orders had been communicated to the Council, first in Latin by the Bishop of Ostia, afterwards explained to the clergy and laity in French by the Bishop of Châlons. It was to ratify this solemn treaty that the Pope had set forth from Rheims ; while he remained in <sup>Treaty  
broken  
off.</sup> the castle of Moisson, the Bishop of Ostia, John Cardinal of Crema, the Bishop of Vivarais, the Bishop of Châlons, and the Abbot of Clugny, began to scrutinize with more severe suspicion the terms of the treaty. They discovered, or thought they discovered, a fraud in the general concession of the investiture of all churches ; it did not express the whole possessions of the churches. The Emperor was indignant at this new objection, and strong mutual recrimination passed between him and the Bishop of Châlons. The King demanded time till the next morning to consider and consult his nobles on the subject. But so little did he expect the sudden rupture of the treaty that he began to discuss the form of his absolution. He thought it beneath his dignity to appear with bare feet before the Pope. The legates condescended to this request, provided the absolution were private. The next Oct. 26. day the Emperor required further delay, and entreated the Pope to remain over the Sunday. But the Pope declared that he had already condescended too far in leaving a general Council to confer with the Emperor, and returned with the utmost haste to Rheims.

At first the conduct of the Pope by no means found universal approval in the council. As the prohibition of the investiture of all churches and ecclesiastical possessions in any manner by lay hands was read, a murmur was heard not merely among the laity, but even among the clergy. It seemed that the Pope would resume all possessions which at any time might have belonged to the Church, and were now in lay hands; the dispute lasted with great acrimony till the evening. On the morning the Pope made a long speech so persuasive that the whole Council bowed to his authority. He proceeded to the excommunication of the Emperor, which he endeavored to array in more than usual awfulness. Four hundred and thirty-seven candles were brought and held lighted in the hands of each of the bishops and abbots. The long endless list of the excommunicated was read, of which the chief were Henry the Emperor, and Burdinus the Antipope. The Pope then solemnly absolved from their allegiance all the subjects of the Emperor. When this was over he pronounced his blessing, in the name of the Father, Son, Nov. 20. and Holy Ghost, and dismissed the Council. After a short time the Pope advanced to Gisors, and had an interview with King Henry of England. Henry boldly justified his seizure of the dukedom of his brother Robert, from the utter incapacity of that prince to administer the affairs of the realm. He had not imprisoned his brother; he had placed him in a royal castle, like a noble pilgrim who was broken with calamities; supplied him with food, and all that might suffice for a pleasant life. The Pope thought it wiser to be content with this hardly specious apology, and gently urged the Norman to make peace with the King of France.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Orderic. Vitalis, i. 2, 13; W. Malmesbury.

Thus acknowledged by the greater part of Christendom, Calixtus II. determined, notwithstanding the unreconciled hostility of the Emperor, to reoccupy his see of Rome. He made a progress through France, distributing everywhere privileges, immunities, dignities; crossed the Alps, and entered Italy by the pass of Susa.<sup>1</sup>

The journey of Calixtus through Italy was a triumphal procession. The Imperialists made no attempt to arrest his march. On his descent of the Alps he was met with loyal deputations from the Lombard cities. Giordano, the Archbishop of Milan, hastened to pay homage to his spiritual sovereign. Landulph, the historian, appeared before the Pope at Tortona to lodge a complaint against the Archbishop for unjustly depriving him of his church. "During the winter we tread not the grapes in the wine-vat," replied Lambert Bishop of Ostia;<sup>2</sup> the Archbishop of Milan, he intimated, was a personage too important to run the risk of his estrangement. Piacenza, Lucca, Pisa, vied with each other in paying honors to the Pope.<sup>3</sup> As he drew near to Rome the Antipope fled and shut himself up in the strong fortress of Sutri. Rome had never received a Pope with greater apparent joy or unanimity. After a short stay Calixtus visited Monte Casino and Benevento. The Duke of Apulia, the Prince of Capua, and the other Norman vassals of the Church hastened to do homage to their liege lord. His royal descent as well as his high spiritual office, gave dignity

<sup>1</sup> Compare the *Regesta* from Nov. 27, 1119, to March, 1120.

<sup>2</sup> Landulph, *jun.*, c. 35.

<sup>3</sup> He was at Piacenza, April 17; Lucca, early in May; Pisa, May 12; Rome, June 3; Monte Casino, July; Benevento, Aug. 8.

to the bearing of Calixtus II. He sustained with equal nobleness the part of King and Pope.

At the commencement of the following year he collected an army to besiege the Antipope Gregory VIII. in Sutri. Gregory in vain looked for succor, for rescue, to the Emperor, who had entirely abandoned, it might seem entirely forgotten, his cause. The Cardinal John of Crema commanded the papal forces. The Pope himself joined the expedition. Sutri made no determined resistance; either through fear or bribery the garrison, after eight days, consented to

Capture and degradation of the Antipope. surrender the miserable Gregory. The cruel and unmanly revenge of Calixtus, if it were

intended as an awful warning against illegitimate usurpers of the papal power, was a signal failure.<sup>1</sup>

The mockery heaped on the unsuccessful Gregory had little effect in deterring future ambitious prelates from setting up as Antipopes. Whenever an Antipope was wanted an Antipope was at hand. Yet degradation and insult could go no further. On a camel instead of a white palfrey, with a bristling hogskin for the scarlet mantle, the Archbishop of Braga was placed with his face towards the rump of the animal, holding the tail for a bridle. In this attire he was compelled to accompany the triumphant procession of the Pope into Rome. He was afterwards dragged about from one convent-

April 23,  
1121.

prison to another, and died at length so utterly forgotten that the place of his death is

doubtful.

The Pope and the Emperor might seem by the sud-

<sup>1</sup> "Ut ipse in suâ confunderetur erubescentiâ, et aliis exemplum præberet, ne similia ulterius attemptare præsumant." — Cardin. Arragon. in Vit. Callist.



den rupture of the negotiations at Moisson Affairs of Germany. and the public renewal of the excommunication at Rheims, to be committed to more implacable hostility. But this rupture, instead of alienating still further the German princes from the Emperor, appeared to strengthen his party. His conduct in that affair excited no disapprobation, no new adversaries availed themselves of the Pope's absolution to renounce their allegiance. In the West of the Empire, when he seemed most completely deserted, a sudden turn took place in his affairs. Many of the most powerful princes, even the Archbishop of Cologne, returned at least to doubtful allegiance. Saxony alone remained in rebellion, and in that province Albert, Archbishop of Mentz, having fled from his metropolitan city, was indefatigable in organizing the revolt.

Henry, having assembled a powerful army in Alsace, and having expelled the rebellious Bishops of Worms and Spire, marched upon Mentz, which he threatened to besiege as the head-quarters of the rebellion.

Albert, as legate of the Pope, appealed to the religion of the Saxons; he appointed fasts, he ordered public prayers to be offered in all the churches: he advanced at length at the head of an army, powerful enough to cope with that of the Emperor, to the relief of Mentz. The hostile armies of Germany were commanded by the temporal and spiritual head, the Emperor and the Primate: a battle seemed inevitable.

But a strong Teutonic feeling had arisen in both parties, and a disinclination to shed blood in a quarrel between the Church and the Empire, which might be reconciled by their commanding mediation. The more extravagant pretensions of both parties were equally

hostile to their interests. It was not the supreme feudal sovereign alone who was injured by the absolute immunity of all ecclesiastical property from feudal claims ; every temporal prince had either suffered loss or was in danger of suffering loss by this slow and irrevocable encroachment of the Church. They were jealous that the ecclesiastics should claim exemptions to which they could have no title. On the other hand it could by no means be their desire that the Emperor should fill all the great ecclesiastical sees, the principalities, as some were, either with his own favorites or sell them to the highest bidder (as some Emperors had been accused of doing, as arbitrary Emperors might do), and so raise a vast and dangerous revenue which, extorted from the Church, might be employed against their civil liberties. Both parties had gradually receded from their extreme claims, and the Pope and the Emperor had made such concessions as, but for mutual suspicion, might at Moisson have led to peace, and had reduced the quarrel almost to a strife of words.

After some negotiation a truce was agreed upon ; twelve princes were chosen from each party to draw up the terms of a future treaty, and a Diet of the Empire summoned to meet at Michaelmas in Wurzburg.

The Emperor appeared with his more distinguished followers in Wurzburg, the Saxon army encamped at a short distance. Hostages were exchanged, and, as Wurzburg could not contain the throng, the negotiations were carried on in the plain without the city.

The Diet had full powers to ratify a peace for the  
Treaty of Wurzburg. Empire ; the terms were simple but comprehensive. The Church and the Empire should each maintain its rights and revenues inviolable ; all

seized or confiscated property was to be restored to its rightful owner ; the rights of each estate of the Empire were to be maintained. An Imperial Edict was to be issued against thieves and robbers, or they were to be dealt with according to the ancient laws ; all violence and all disturbance of the peace to be suppressed. The King was to be obedient to the Pope, and with the consent and aid of the princes make peace with him, so that each should quietly possess his own, the Emperor the rights of the Empire, the Pope those of the Church. The bishops lawfully elected and consecrated retained their sees till the arrival of the Pope in Germany, those of Worms and Spire were to be restored to their dioceses ; hostages and prisoners to be liberated on both sides. But the dispute between the Pope and the Emperor concerning the investitures was beyond the powers of the Diet, and the papal excommunication was revocable by the Pope alone. These points therefore were reserved till the Pope should arrive in Germany to hold a General Council. But the Emperor gave the best pledge in his power for his sincerity in seeking reconciliation with the Church. He had granted a general amnesty to the rebellious prelates ; he had agreed to restore the expelled Bishops of Worms and Spire. Even Conrad, Archbishop of Salzburg, who had taken an active part in the war against Henry, had been compelled to fly, and to conceal himself in a cave for a year, returned to his bishopric. On their side the Saxon bishops did not decline to enter into communion with the Emperor ; for even the prelates most sternly adverse to Henry did not condescend to notice the papal absolution from their allegiance ; it was considered as something which had not taken place.

Notwithstanding an ill-timed dispute concerning the succession to the bishopric of Wurzburg, which led to some hostilities, and threatened at the last hour to break up the amicable settlement, affairs went smoothly on.

The Pope himself wrote with the earnestness and conciliatory tone of one disposed to peace. He reminded Henry of their consanguinity, and welcomed him as the dutiful son of St. Peter, as worthy both as a man and as an Emperor of the more affectionate love and honor of the Holy See, as he had surpassed his later predecessors in obedience to the Church of Rome. He emphatically disclaimed all intention in the Church to trench on the prerogative of the Empire.<sup>1</sup>

The treaty was framed at Mentz under the auspices of the papal legates, Lambert Bishop of Ostia, Saxo Cardinal of Monte Cælio, and the Cardinal Gregory. It was sealed with the golden seal of the Empire by the Chancellor, the Archbishop of Cologne; it was subscribed by the Archbishops of Cologne and Mentz, the Bishops of Bamberg, Spire, Augsburg, Utrecht, and Constance, and the Abbot of Fulda; by Duke Frederick of Swabia, Henry of Bavaria, the Margraves Boniface and Theobald, the Palsgrave of the Rhine, and some other princes.

So was it ratified at Worms by the papal legate and accepted by the German people.

These were the terms of this important treaty, which were read to the German nation amid loud applauses,

<sup>1</sup> "Nihil de tuo jure vindicare sibi curat ecclesia; nec regni nec imperii gloriam affectamus; obtineat ecclesia, quod Christi est; habeat Imperator quod suum est."

and received as the fundamental principles of the Papal and Imperial rights.

The Emperor gives up to God, to St. Peter, and to the Catholic Church, the right of investiture by the ring and the pastoral staff; he grants to the clergy throughout the Empire the right of free election; he restores to the Church of Rome, to all other churches and nobles, the possessions and feudal sovereignties which have been seized during the wars in his father's time and his own, those in his possession immediately, and he promises his influence to obtain restitution of those not in his possession. He grants peace to the Pope and to all his partisans, and pledges himself to protect, whenever he shall be thereto summoned, the Church of Rome in all things.

The Pope grants that all elections of bishops and abbots should take place in the presence of the Emperor or his commissioners, only without bribery and violence, with an appeal in cases of contested elections to the metropolitan and provincial bishops. The bishop elect in Germany was to receive, by the touch of the sceptre, all the temporal rights, principalities, and possessions of the see, excepting those which were held immediately of the See of Rome; and faithfully discharge to the Emperor all duties incident to those principalities. In all other parts of the Empire the royalties were to be granted to the bishop consecrated within six months. The Pope grants peace to the Emperor and his adherents, and promises aid and assistance on all lawful occasions.

The treaty was ratified by the most solemn religious ceremony. The papal legate, the Bishop of A.D. 1122. Ostia, celebrated the mass, administered the Eucharist



to the Emperor, declared him to be reconciled with the Holy See, and received him and all his partisans with the kiss of peace into the bosom of the Catholic Church. The Lateran Council ratified this momentous treaty, which became thereby the law of Christendom.

Feb. 27,  
1128. So closed one period of the long strife between the Church and the Empire. The Christendom of our own calmer times, when these questions, excepting among rigid controversialists, are matters of remote history, may wonder that where the principles of justice, dominant at the time, were so plain and simple, and where such slight and equitable concessions on either side set this long quarrel at rest, Germany should be wasted by civil war, Italy suffer more than one disastrous invasion, one Emperor be reduced to the lowest degradation, more than one Pope be exposed to personal insult and suffering, in short, that such long, bloody, and implacable warfare should lay waste a large part of Europe, on points which admitted such easy adjustment. But, as usual in the collision of great interests, the point in dispute was not the sole, nor even the chief object of the conflict: it was on one part the total independence, and through the independence the complete ascendancy; on the other, if not the absolute subjugation, the secret subservience of the spiritual power; which the more sagacious and ambitious of each party aimed eventually at securing to themselves. Both parties had gradually receded from this remote and unacknowledged purpose, and now contended on open and ostensible ground. The Pope either abandoned as unattainable, or no longer aspired to make the Church absolutely independent both as to election and as to the possession

of vast feudal rights without the obligations of feudal obedience to the Empire. In Germany alone the bishops and abbots were sovereign princes of such enormous territorial possessions and exalted rank, that if constant and unswerving subjects and allies of the Pope, they would have kept the Empire in complete subjugation to Rome. But this rival sway had been kept down through the direct influence exercised by the Emperor in the appointment, and his theoretic power at least of withholding the temporalities of the great spiritual fiefs ; and the exercise of this power led to monstrous abuses, the secularization of the Church, the transformation of bishops and abbots to laymen invested in mitres and cowls. The Emperor could not hope to maintain the evils of the old system, the direct appointment of his creatures, boys or rude soldiers, to those great sees or abbacies ; or to sell them and receive in payment some of the estates of the Church, and so to create an unconstitutional and independent revenue. It was even a wiser policy, as concerned his temporal interests, to elevate the order in that decent and imposing character which belonged to their sacred calling — to Teutonize the Teutonic hierarchy.

Indirect influence through the chapters might raise up, if a more free and more respected, yet more loyal race of churchmen ; if more independent of the Empire they would likewise be more independent of the Pope ; they would be Germans as well as churchmen ; become not the sworn, immitigable enemies, but the allies, the bulwarks of the Imperial power. So in the subsequent contest the armies of the Hohenstaufen, at least of Frederick Barbarossa, appear commanded by the great

prelates of the Empire ; and even Frederick II., if he had been more of a German, less of an Italian sovereign, might, supported by the German hierarchy, have maintained the contest with greater hopes of success.

## CHAPTER IV.

## ST. BERNARD AND INNOCENT II.

CALIXTUS II. had restored peace to Christendom ; his strong arm during the latter part of his Pontificate kept even Rome in quiet obedience. He compelled both citizens and strangers to abandon the practice of wearing arms ; he levelled some of the strongholds from which the turbulent nobles sallied forth with their lawless followers to disturb the peace of the city, and to interfere in the election of Popes, or to defend some usurping Antipope against the legitimate Bishop of Rome : the tower of Cencius and that of Donna Bona were razed to the ground. But neither Calixtus nor Henry lived to see the effects of the pacification. The death of Calixtus took place a year before that of the Emperor.<sup>1</sup> With Henry V. closed the line of the Franconian Cæsars in Germany ; the second family which, since the separation of the dominions of Charlemagne, had handed down the Empire for several generations in regular descent. Of the Franconian Emperors, the first had been the faithful allies of the Papacy ; the restorers of the successors of St. Peter to freedom, power, and even sanctity, which they had lost,

<sup>1</sup> Death of Calixtus, 1124 (rather Dec. 13 or 14, 1123). The death of Henry, 1125, May 23. — Falco Beneventanus in *Chronica* ; Pandulphus Pisanus.

and seemed in danger of losing forever, as the slaves and instruments of the wild barons and potentates of Rome and the Romagna. The two later Kings, the Henrys, had been in perpetual and dangerous conflict with those Pontiffs whom their fathers had reinvested in dignity.

Calixtus had controlled, but not extinguished the Roman factions; they were only gathering strength and animosity to renew the strife for his spoils, to contest the appointment of his successors. Even on the death of Calixtus, a double election, but for the unwonted prudence and moderation of one of the candidates, might have broken out into a new schism, and a new civil war. The Frangipanis were at the head of one faction, Peter the son of Leo of the other.

A.D. 1124.

Dec. 15, 16.

They watched the last hours of the expiring Pontiff with outward signs of agreement, but with the inward determination each to supplant the other by the rapidity of his proceedings. Lambert of Ostia, the legate who had conducted the treaty of pacification in Germany, was the Pope of the Frangipani. Their party had the scarlet robe ready to invest him. While the assembled Bishops in the Church of San Pancrazio had already elected Tebaldo Buccapecco, the Cardinal of Santa Anastasia, and were singing the *Te Deum*, Robert Frangipani proclaimed Lambert as Pope Elect, amid the acclamations of the people. Happily, however, one was as sincerely humble as the other ambitious.<sup>1</sup> The Cardinal of Santa Anastasia yielded up his claim without hesitation; yet so doubtful did the legality of his election appear to the Pope himself, that,

<sup>1</sup> Jaffé however says, I think without ground, "*Voluntate an coactus abdicaverit, parum liquet.*"



twelve days after, he resigned the Papacy into the hands of the Cardinals, and went through the forms of a new election.

The Pontificate of Honorius II., during six years, was not marked by any great event, except <sup>A.D. 1124-1130.</sup> the accession of the Saxon house to the Imperial throne. Yet the thunders of the Vatican were not silent; his reign is marked by the anathemas which he pronounced, not now against invaders of his ecclesiastical rights and possessions. The temporal interests and the spiritual supremacy of the Popes became more and more identified; all invasion of the actual property of the Pope, or the feudal superiority which he might claim, was held as sacrilege, and punished by the spiritual censure of excommunication. Already the Lateran Council, under Calixtus, had declared that any one who attacked the city of Benevento, being the Pope's (a strong city of refuge, in the south of Italy, either against a hostile Emperor or the turbulent Romans, was of infinite importance to the Pontiff), was under anathema. The feudal sovereignty of the whole South of Italy, which the Popes, on some vague claim as representatives of the Emperors, had appropriated to the Roman See, and which the Normans, holding only by the precarious tenure of conquest, were not inclined to dispute, since it confirmed their own rights, was protected by the same incongruous arms; and not by these arms alone, Honorius himself at times headed the Papal forces in the South.<sup>1</sup> When Roger the Norman laid claim to the succession of William Duke of

<sup>1</sup> See Chron. Foss. Nov., Falco Beneventan., Romuald. Salernit. for brief notices of the Pope's campaigns. Apud Muratori, G. R. It. vii. Council at Troja, Nov. 11, 1127.

Apulia, who had died childless, the Pope being unfavorable to his pretensions, he was cut off from the Church of Christ by the same summary sentence.

In Germany all was peace between the Empire and the Papacy. Lothair the Saxon, the faithful head of the Papal party, had been elected to the Empire. Honorius, in gratitude for past services, and in prophetic dread of the rising power of the Hohenstaufen, hastened to recognize the Emperor. Lothair, in his humble submission, did not demand the homage of the clergy for their Imperial fiefs.<sup>1</sup> Conrad, the nephew of the deceased King Henry, having attempted to seize the kingdom of Italy, was excommunicated as a rebel against his rightful Sovereign. The humiliation of his rival Frederick of Swabia, and the failure of Conrad, left the Papalizing Emperor in his undisturbed supremacy.

April 24,  
1128.

The death of Honorius was the signal for a more violent collision between the ruling factions at Rome. They watched the dying Pope with indecent impatience. In secret, (it was asserted before the death, certainly on the day of the death and before the funeral of Honorius,) a minority of the Cardinals, but those, in their own estimation and in that of their adherents, the most eminent, elected Gregory, the Cardinal of St. Angelo, who took the name of Innocent II.<sup>2</sup> The more numerous party,

Feb. 14, 1130.  
Contested  
election.  
Innocent II.  
Anacletus II.

<sup>1</sup> Jaffé, Lothair, p. 36, &c.

<sup>2</sup> St. Bernard himself admits some irregularity at least in the election of Innocent. "Nam etsi quid minus forte sollemniter, et minus ordinabiliter processit, in eâ quæ præcessit, ut hostes unitatis contendunt." Bernard argues that they ought to have waited the formal examination of this point, and not proceeded to another election. But if the election was irregular and uncanonical, it was null of itself.

waiting a more decent and more canonical time for their election, chose the Cardinal Peter Leonis, one of the sons of that Peter who had so long been conspicuous in Roman politics. He called himself Anacletus II. On his side Anacletus had the more canonical election, the majority of the Cardinals,<sup>1</sup> the strongest party in Rome. He immediately made overtures to Roger Duke of Sicily, who had been excommunicated by Honorius. The Sicilian espoused at once the cause of Anacletus, in order to deserve the title of King, the aim of his ambition. Thus there was a complete revolution in the parties at Rome. The powerful family of Peter Leonis and the Normans were on the side of the Pope, eventually reputed the Antipope; the Emperor with all Northern Christendom united for the successful, as he was afterwards called, the orthodox Pontiff. The enemies of Leo (Anacletus), who scrupled at no calumny,<sup>2</sup> attributed his success to his powerful connections of family and of interest. He inherited a vast patrimonial property; he had increased it by a large share in the exactions of the Curia, the Chancery of Rome, of which he had the command, and in legations. These treasures he had carefully

<sup>1</sup> There were 16 cardinals for Innocent, 32 for Anacletus. — Anonym. apud Baronium, *Epist.*, pp. 191, 192, 196. Other writers, of inferior authority, deny this.

<sup>2</sup> "Qui licet monachus, presbyter, cardinalis esset, scorto conjugatus, monachas, sororem propriam, etiam consanguineas ad instar canis quoquo modo habere potuit, non defecit." — *Epist. Mantuin. Episcop.* apud Neugart, *diplom. Alemanniæ*, 63, 64. Yet there seems no doubt that the Epistle of Peter the Cardinal, written by St. Bernard (notwithstanding Mabillon's doubts), was addressed to Anacletus. "Diligimus enim bonam famam vestram, reveremur quam in vobis audivimus circa res Dei sollicitudinem et sinceritatem." Jaffé (p. 89) well observes that it would be fatal to the character of Calixtus II. to have promoted a man of such monstrous dissoluteness to the cardinalate.

hoarded for his great object, the Pontificate. Besides this, he scrupled not, it is said, to convert the sacred wealth of the churches to his use; and when the Christians trembled to break up the silver vessels and crucifixes, he called in the Jews to this unholy work. Thus it is acknowledged that almost all Rome was on his side; Rome, won, as his enemies aver, by these guilty and sacrilegious means and maintained by the harshest cruelties.<sup>1</sup>

Innocent had in Rome the Frangipanis, a strong minority of the Cardinals, the earlier though questionable election; he had the indelible prejudice against his adversary — his name and descent from a Jew and an usurer.<sup>2</sup> But he obtained before long the support of the Emperor Lothair, of the King of France, of Henry King of England, and, greater than these, of one to whom he owed their faithful aid, who ruled the

<sup>1</sup> Innocent thus arraigns his rival: — “Qui papatum a longis retro temporibus affectaverat, parentum violentiâ, sanguinis effusione, destructione sacrarum imaginum, beati Petri cathedram occupavit et peregrinos ac religiosos quosdam ad apostolorum limina venientes captos, et tetrâ carceris squaloribus ac ferreis vinculis mancipatos fame, siti, diversisque tormentorum generibus tormentare non desinit.” — Pisa, June 20, apud Jaffé, p. 561. On the other hand Anacletus asserts, “Clerus omnis Romanus individuâ nobis charitate cohaeret: præfectus urbis Leo Frangipane cum filio et Cencio Frangipane [this was after the flight of Innocent] et nobiles omnes, et plebs omnis Romana consuetam nobis fidelitatem fecerunt.” — Baronius, sub ann. 1130.

<sup>2</sup> In the account of the Council of Rheims by Ordericus Vitalis, we read that Calixtus II. declared his willingness to liberate the son of Peter the son of Leo, whom he had brought with him as one of the hostages of the former treaty with the Emperor. “So saying, he pointed to a dark pale youth, more like a Jew or a Hagarene than a Christian, clothed in rich raiment, but deformed in person. The Franks, who saw him standing by the Pope, mocked him, imprecated disgrace and ruin on his head from their hatred to his father, whom they knew to be a most unscrupulous usurer.” This deformed boy could not be the future Pope, then probably a monk; most likely it was a brother.

minds of all these Sovereigns, Bernard, the Abbot of Clairvaux.

For half this century the Pope ceases to be the centre around whom gather the great events of Christian history, from whose heart or from whose mind flow forth the impulses which animate and guide Latin Christendom, towards whom converge the religious thoughts of men. Bernard of Clairvaux, now rising to the height of his power and influence, is at once the leading and the governing head of Christendom. He rules alike the monastic world, in all the multiplying and more severe convents which were springing up in every part of Europe, the councils of temporal sovereigns, and the intellectual developments of the age. He is peopling all these convents with thousands of ardent votaries of every rank and order; he heals the schism in the Papacy; he preaches a new crusade, in which a King and an Emperor lead the armies of the Cross; he is believed by an admiring age to have confuted Abélard himself, and to have repressed the more dangerous doctrines of Arnold of Brescia. His almost worshipping admirers adorn his life with countless miracles; posterity must admit the almost miraculous power with which he was endowed of guiding the minds of men in passive obedience. The happy congeniality of his character, opinions, eloquence, piety, with all the stronger sentiments and passions of the time, will account in great part for his ascendancy; but the man must have been blessed with an amazing native power and greatness, which alone could raise him so high above a world actuated by the same influences.

Bernard did not originate this new outburst of mo-



nasticism, which had already made great progress in Germany, and was growing to its height in parts of France. He was a dutiful son rather than one of the parents of that great Cistercian order, which was now commencing its career in all its more attractive seclusion from the world, and its more than primitive austerity of discipline; which in a short time became famous, and through its fame covered France, parts of England, and some other countries, with new monasteries under a more rigorous rule, and compelled some of the old institutions to submit to a harsher discipline. These foundations, after emulating or surpassing the ancient Benedictine brotherhoods in austerity, poverty, obedience, solitude, grew to equal and surpass them in splendor, wealth, and independent power.

It was this wonderful attribute of the monastic system to renew its youth, which was the life of mediæval Christianity; it was ever reverting of itself to the first principles of its constitution. It seized alike on all the various nations which now formed Latin Christendom; the Northern as the Southern, the German as the Italian. In this adventurous age there must be room and scope for every kind of religious adventure. The untamable independence and individuality of the Teutonic character, now dominant throughout Germany, France, and England, still displays itself, notwithstanding the complicated system of feudal tenures and their bondage, in the perpetual insubordination of the nobles to the sovereign, in private wars, in feats of hardihood and enterprise, bordering constantly on the acts of the robber, the freebooter, and the pirate. It had been at once fostered by, and found vent in the Crusades, which called on every one to become a war-

rior on his own account, and enrolled him not as a conscript or even as a feudal retainer, but as a free and voluntary soldier of the Cross, seeking glory or plunder for himself, or working out his own salvation by deeds of valor against the Unbelievers.

It was the same within the more immediate sphere of religion. When that yearning for inde-<sup>Thirst for religious adventure.</sup>pendence, that self-isolating individuality was found in connection with the strong and profound passion for devotion, there was nothing in the ordinary and established forms to satisfy the aspirations of this inordinate piety. Notwithstanding, or rather because of the completely organized system of Church government throughout the West, which gave to every province its metropolitan, to every city its bishop, to every parish its priest, there could not but be a perpetual insurrection, as it were, of men ambitious of something higher, more peculiar, more extraordinary, more their own. The stated and uniform service of the Church, the common instruction, must be suited to the ordinary level of faith and knowledge: they knew no change, no progress, no accommodation to more earnest or craving spirits. The almost universal secularization of the clergy would increase this holy dissatisfaction. Even the Pope had become a temporal sovereign, the metropolitan a prince, the bishop a baron, the priest perhaps the chaplain to a marauding army. At all events the ceremonial of the Church went on in but stately uniformity; the most religious man was but a member of the same Christian flock; there was little emulation or distinction. But all this time monastic Christianity was in the theory of the Church the only real Christian perfection; the one sublime, almost the one safe course,

was the total abnegation of the monk, renunciation of the world, solitude, asceticism, stern mortification. Man could not inflict upon himself too much humiliation and misery. The true Christian life was one long unbroken penance. Holiness was measured by suffering; the more remote from man the nearer to God. All human sympathies, all social feelings, all ties of kindred, all affections were to be torn up by the roots from the groaning spirit; pain and prayer, prayer and pain, were to be the sole, stirring, unwearying occupations of a saintly life.

All these more aspiring and restless and insatiable spirits the monasteries invited within their hallowed walls; to all these they promised peace. But they could rarely fulfil their promise; even they could not satisfy the yearnings for religious adventure. Most of the old monasteries which held the rule either of St. Benedict or of Cassian had become wealthy, and suffered the usual effects of wealth. Some had altogether relaxed their discipline, had long renounced poverty; and the constant dissensions, the appeals to the bishop, to the metropolitan, or where, as they all strove to do, they had obtained exemption from episcopal jurisdiction, to the Pope, showed how entirely the other great vow, obedience to the abbot or prior, had become obsolete. The best were regular and tranquil; they had achieved their labors, they had fertilized their immediate territory, and as though they had now but to enjoy the fruits of their toil, they sunk to indolent repose. Even where the discipline was still severe, it was monotonous, to some extent absolute; its sanctity was exacted, habitual, unawakening. All old establishments are impatient of innovation; a higher flight of

devotion becomes insubordination, or a tacit reproach on the ordinary course. Monasticism had been and was ever tracing the same cycle. Now the wilderness, the utter solitude, the utmost poverty, the contest with the stubborn forest and unwholesome morass, the most exalted piety, the devotion which had not hours enough during the day and night for its exercise, the rule which could not be enforced too strictly, the strongly competing asceticism, the inventive self-discipline, the inexhaustible, emulous ingenuity of self-torture, the boastful servility of obedience : then the fame for piety, the lavish offerings of the faithful, the grants of the repentant lord, the endowments of the remorseful king — the opulence, the power, the magnificence. The wattled hut, the rock-hewn hermitage, is now the stately cloister ; the lowly church of wood the lofty and gorgeous abbey ; the wild forest or heath the pleasant and umbrageous grove ; the marsh a domain of intermingling meadow and cornfields ; the brawling stream or mountain torrent a succession of quiet tanks or pools fattening innumerable fish. The superior, once a man bowed to the earth with humility, careworn, pale, emaciated, with a coarse habit bound with a cord, with naked feet, is become an abbot on his curvetting palfrey, in rich attire, with his silver cross borne before him, travelling to take his place amid the lordliest of the realm.

New orders therefore and new institutions were ever growing out of the old, and hosts of youthful zealots were ripe and eager for their more extreme demands of self-sacrifice, and that which appeared to be self-abandonment, but in fact was often a loftier form of self-adoration. Already, centuries past, in the Bene-

dictine abbeys, the second Benedict (of Aniane) had commenced a new era of discipline, mortification, saintliness according to the monastic notion of saintship. But that era, like the old one, had gradually passed away. Again, in the preceding century, Clugny had displayed this marvellous inward force, this reconstructing, reorganizing, reanimating energy of monasticism. It had furnished the line of German pontiffs to the papacy, it had trained Hildebrand for the papal throne and placed him upon it. But Clugny was now undergoing the inevitable fate of degeneracy: it was said that the Abbot Pontius had utterly forgotten the stern inflexibility of his great predecessor St. Hugh: he had become worldly, and as worldly, weak in discipline.

But in the mean while, in a remote and almost inaccessible corner of Burgundy, had been laid the foundations of a community which by the time that the mind of Bernard of Clairvaux should be ripe for his great change, would be prepared to satisfy the fervid longings even of a spirit so intensely burning with the fire of devotion. The first origin of this fraternity is one of the most striking and characteristic stories of this religious age. Two brothers of the noble house of Molesme were riding through a wild forest, in arms, on their way to a neighboring tournament. Suddenly in the mind of each rose the awful thought, "What if I should murder my brother, and so secure the whole of our inheritance!" The strong power of love, of virtue, of religion, or whatever influence was employed by the divine blessing, wrestled down in each the dark temptation. Some years after they passed again the same dreary road;



the recollection of their former trial came back upon their minds ; they shuddered at once at the fearful power of the Tempter. They hastened to confess themselves to a holy hermit ; they then communicated each to the other their fratricidal thoughts ; they determined to abandon forever a world which abounded in such dreadful suggestions, to devote their lives to the God who had saved them from such appalling sin. So rose at Molesme a small community, which rapidly became a monastery. The brothers, however, disappear, at least are not the most conspicuous in the history of this community. In the monastery, in the forest of Colan near Molesme, arose dissension, at length secession. Some of the most rigid, including the abbot, the prior, and Stephen Harding, an Englishman, <sup>Stephen Harding.</sup> sought a more complete solitude, a more obstinate wilderness to tame, more sense-subduing poverty, more intense mortification. They found it in a desert place on the borders of Champagne and Burgundy. Nothing could appear more stubborn, more dismal, more hopeless than this spot ; it suited their rigid mood ; they had more than once the satisfaction of almost perishing by famine. The monastery of Cîteaux had not yet softened away the savage character of the wilderness around when it opened its gates to Bernard of Clairvaux. Stephen Harding had become its abbot, and Stephen was the true founder of the Cistercian Order.

Stephen Harding had been bestowed as an offering by his pious parents on the monastery of Sherborne in Dorsetshire. There he received his education, there he was fed with cravings for higher devotion which Sherborne could not satisfy. He wandered as a pilgrim to

Rome; he returned with his spiritual wants still more pressing, more fastidious, more insatiate. Among the brethren of Molesme he found for a time a relief for his soul's necessities: but even from Molesme he was driven forth in search of profound peace, of more full satisfaction; and he was among the seven who retired into the more desolate and unapproachable Citeaux.<sup>1</sup>

Citeaux. Yet already had Citeaux, though still rude and struggling as it were, with the forest and the marsh, acquired fame. Odo, the mighty Duke of Burgundy, the first patron of the new community, had died in the Holy Land. Ere he expired he commanded that his remains should not rest in the vaults of his cathedral at Dijon, or any of the more stately abbeys of his land, where there were lordly prelates or chapters of priests to celebrate daily the splendid masses with their solemn music for his soul. He desired that they should rest in the humble chapel of Citeaux, blessed by the more prevailing prayers of its holy monks. In after ages Citeaux, become magnificent, was the burying-place of the Dukes of Burgundy; but over their gorgeous marble tombs it might be questioned whether such devout and earnest supplications were addressed to heaven as by the simple choir of Stephen Harding.

But its glory and its power rose not from the sepulture of the Dukes of Burgundy, but from the entrance of the living Bernard within its walls.<sup>2</sup> Bernard was

<sup>1</sup> Compare the Life of Harding, in the Lives of the English Saints. If the writers of some of these biographies had condescended to write history rather than to revive legend, they might, from their research and exquisite charm of style, have enriched our literature.

<sup>2</sup> The Life of St. Bernard (the first book) by William the Abbot (Gulielmus Abbas), was written during his lifetime, but without the

born of noble parentage in Burgundy. His father, Tecelin, was a man of great bravery and unimpeachable honor and justice; his mother, Alith, likewise of high birth, a model of devotion and charity. Bernard was the third of six brothers; he had one sister. The mother, who had secretly vowed all her children to God, took the chief part in their early education, especially in that of Bernard, a simple and studious, a thoughtful and gentle youth, yet even in childhood of strong will and visionary imagination. The mother's death confirmed the influence of her life. Having long practised secretly the severest monastic discipline, she breathed out her spirit amid the psalms of the clergy around her bed: the last movement of her lips was praise to God.

The world was open to the youth of high birth, beautiful person, graceful manners, irresistible influence. The Court would at once have welcomed a young knight, so endowed, with her highest honors, her most intoxicating pleasures; the Church would have trained a noble disciple so richly gifted for her most powerful bishoprics or her wealthiest abbeys. He closed his eyes upon the world, on the worldly Church, with stern determination. He became at once master of his passions. His eyes had dwelt too long and too curiously on a beautiful female; he plunged to the neck in a pool of cold water. His chastity underwent, but unattainted, severer trials. Yet he resolved to abandon this incorrigible world altogether. He inquired for the poorest, the most inaccessible, the most austere of monasteries. It was

knowledge or sanction of Bernard. The second book bears the name of Bernard, Abbot of Beauvale.

that of Citeaux. He arrived at the gates, but not alone. Already his irresistible influence had drawn around him thirty followers, all equally resolute in the renunciation of secular life, in submission to the most rigorous discipline; some, men of middle life, versed in, but weary of, the world; most, like himself, youths of noble birth, with life untried and expanding in its most dazzling promise before them. But this was not all; his mother's vow must be fulfilled. One after the other the strange and irresistible force of his character enthralled his brothers, and at length his sister. Two of the brothers with an uncle followed his steps at once: the elder, Guido, was married; his wife refused to yield up her claims on her husband's love. A seasonable illness enforced her submission; she too retired to a convent. A wound in the side, prophesied, it was said, by Bernard, brought another, a gallant warrior, as a heart-stricken penitent into his company. When they all left the castle of their fathers, where they had already formed a complete monastic brotherhood, Guido, the elder, addressed Nivard the youngest son. "To you remains the whole patrimony of our house." "Earth to me and heaven to you, that is no fair partition," said the boy. He lingered a short time with his aged father and then joined the rest. Even the father died a monk of Clairvaux in the arms of Bernard. But it was not on his own kindred alone that Bernard wrought with this commanding power. When he was to preach, wives hurried away their husbands, mothers withdrew their sons, friends their friends, from the resistless magic of his eloquence.

Notwithstanding its fame, the Cistercian monastery up to this time had been content with a few unincreas-

ing votaries. Warlike and turbulent Burgundy furnished only here and there some conscience-stricken disciple to its dreary cells. The accession of the noble Bernard, of his kindred and his followers, raised at once the popularity and crowded the dormitories of this remote cloister. But Bernard himself dwelt in subjection, in solitude, in study. He was alone, except when on his knees with the rest in the choir; the forest oaks and beeches were his beloved companions; he diligently read the sacred scriptures; he strove to work out his own conception of perfect and angelic A.D. 1113. religion. He attained a height of abstraction from earthly things which might have been envied by an Indian Yogue. He had so absolutely withdrawn his senses from communion with the world that they seemed dead to all outward impressions: his eyes did not tell him whether his chamber was ceiled or not, whether it had one window or three. Of the scanty food which he took rather to avert death than to sustain life, his unconscious taste had lost all perception whether it was nauseous or wholesome. Yet Bernard thought himself but in his novitiate; others might have attained, he had but begun his sanctification. He labored with the hardest laborers, discharged the most menial offices, was everybody's slave; the more degrading the office the more acceptable to Bernard.

But the monastery of Stephen Harding could no longer contain its thronging votaries. From this metropolis of holiness Bernard was chosen to lead Clairvaux. the first colony. There was a valley in Champagne, not far from the river Aube, called the Valley of Wormwood, infamous as a den of robbers: Bernard and his companions determined to change it into a temple of



God. It was a savage, terrible solitude, so utterly barren that at first they were reduced to live on beech-leaves: they suffered the direst extremity of famine, until the patient faith of Bernard was rewarded by supplies pouring in from the reverential piety of the neighboring peasants.

To the gate of Clairvaux (Bernard's new monastery had taken that musical name, to which he has given immortality) came his sister, who was nobly married, in great state and with a splendid retinue. Not one of her brothers would go out to see her — she was spurned from the door as a sinner. "If I am a sinner," she meekly replied, "I am one of those for whom Christ died, and have the greater need of my brothers' kindly counsel. Command, I am ready to obey!" Bernard was moved; he could not separate her from her husband, but he adjured her to renounce all her worldly pomp. Humbeline obeyed, devoted herself to fasting and prayer, and at length retired into a convent.

Bernard's life would have been cut short by his austerities; this slow suicide would have deprived the Church of the last of her Fathers. But he had gone to receive orders from the Bishop of Châlons, William of Champeaux, the great dialectician, the teacher and the adversary of Abélard. With him he contracted a strong friendship. The wise counsel, and something like the pious fraud (venial here if ever) of this good prelate, compelled him to support his health, that most precious gift of God, without which the other high gifts of the Creator were without value.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The more mature wisdom of Bernard viewed this differently. "Non ergo est temperantia in solis resecandis superfluis, est et in admittendis necessariis." — *De Consider.*, i. viii. Compare the whole chapter.

The fame and influence of Bernard spread rapidly and widely; his irresistible preaching awed and won all hearts. Everywhere Bernard was called in as the great pacificator of religious, and even of civil dissensions. His justice, his mildness, were equally commanding and persuasive. It was a free and open court, to which all might appeal without cost; from which all retired, even if without success, without dissatisfaction; convinced, if condemned by Bernard, of his own wrongfulness. His wondering followers saw miracles in all his acts,<sup>1</sup> prophecies in all his words. The Gospels contain not such countless wonders as the life of Bernard. Clairvaux began to send forth its colonies; to Clairvaux all looked back with fervent attachment to their founder, and carried his name with them by degrees through France, and Italy, and Germany, to England and Spain.

Bernard, worthy as he was, according to the biographer, to be compelled to accept them, firmly declined all ecclesiastical dignities. The Abbot of Clairvaux, with all the wealth and all the honors of the Church at his feet, while he made and unmade Popes, remained but the simple Abbot.

From the schism in the Papal See between Innocent II. and Anacletus II., his life is the history of the Western Church.

Innocent, not without difficulty, had escaped from Rome, had dropped down to the mouth of the Tiber, and reached the port of Pisa. Mes-

May, June,  
1130.  
Innocent in  
France.

<sup>1</sup> Some of them, of course, sink to the whimsical and the puerile. On one occasion he excommunicated the flies, which disturbed and defiled a church; they fell dead, and were swept off the floor by baskets-full.

the support of the Transalpine Sovereigns, more especially of Louis the Fat, the King of France. The King, who had now become a recognized protector of the Pope, summoned a Council of the Archbishops and Bishops of the realm at Etampes. Both the King and the Prelates imperatively required the presence of Bernard, the holy Abbot of Clairvaux. Bernard arrived, torn reluctant, and not without fear, from his tranquil seclusion, and thus plunged at once into the affairs of the world. The whole assembly, the King and the Prelates, with flattering unanimity, referred the decision of this momentous question to him alone. Thus was Bernard in one day the arbiter of the religious destinies of Christendom. Was he so absolutely superior to that last infirmity of noble minds as to be quite undazzled by the unexpected majesty of his position? He prayed earnestly; did he severely and indifferently examine this great cause? The burning passion of his letters, after he had embraced the cause of Innocent, does not impress the unbiased inquirer with the calmness of his deliberations. To the Archbishop of Tours, who was slow to acknowledge the superior validity of Sept. 11, 1130. Innocent's claims, he writes peremptorily — "The abomination of desolation is in the holy places. Antichrist, in persecuting Innocent, is persecuting all innocence: banished from Rome, he is accepted by the world."<sup>1</sup>

Innocent hastened to the hospitable shores of France. Oct. 25. He landed at St. Gilles, in Provence, and proceeded by Viviers and Puy, in Auvergne, to the monastery of Clugny. There he was received, in the King's name, by Suger, Abbot of St. Denys, and pro-

<sup>1</sup> "Pulsus ab urbe, ab orbe receptus." — Epist. 124.

ceeded with horses and with a suitable retinue upon his journey. At Clermont he held a Council, Nov. 18, 29. and received the allegiance of two of the great Prelates of Germany, those of Salzburg and Munster. Near Orleans he was welcomed by the King and his family with every mark of reverence and submission. At Chartres another monarch, Henry I. of Jan. 30, 1131. England, acknowledged Innocent as the legitimate successor of St. Peter.<sup>1</sup> The influence of Bernard had overruled the advice of the English Prelates, and brought this second kingly spiritual vassal, though reluctant, to the feet of Innocent. "Thou fearest the sin of acknowledging Innocent: answer thou for thy other sins, be that upon my head."<sup>2</sup> Such was the language of Bernard to the King of England. The Pontiff condescended to visit Rouen, where the Norman Barons, and even the Jews of the city, made him splendid presents. From Germany had come May 10. an embassy to declare, that the Emperor Lothair and a Council of sixteen Bishops, at Wurtzburg, had acknowledged Innocent. Anacletus was not only rejected, but included under proscription with the disobedient Frederick the Hohenstaufen and Conrad the King of Italy; they and all their partisans were menaced with excommunication. The ambassadors in- Council of Rheims. Oct. 18. vited Innocent to visit Germany. He held his first Council at Rheims, where he crowned the King of France and his infant son. He visited, before or after the Council, other parts of France. He was at Etampes, Châlons, Cambray, Laon, Paris, Beauvais, Compiègne, Auxerre, as well as at Liège, Rouen, Gisors,

<sup>1</sup> William Malmesbury. — Cardin. Arragon. in Vit.

<sup>2</sup> Vita Bernardi.

Pont-Ysère, with Bernard as his inseparable companion. In public affairs he appeared to consult his Cardinals ; but every measure had been previously discussed in his private conferences with the Abbot of Clairvaux.

At Liège.  
March 22,  
1131.

Bernard accompanied him to Liège. The Pope was received with the highest honors by the Emperor Lothair ; the Emperor held the reins of the Pope's white palfrey ; but to the dismay of Innocent and his Cardinals, Lothair renewed the old claim to the investitures ;<sup>1</sup> and seemed disposed to enforce his demand as the price of his allegiance, if not by stronger measures. Innocent thought of the fate of Paschal, and trembled at the demand of the Barbarian. But the eloquence of Bernard overawed the Emperor : Lothair submitted to the spell of his authority.<sup>2</sup> On his return from Liège, the Pope visited the Abbey of Clairvaux. It was a strange contrast with the magnificence of his reception in the stately churches of Rheims, of Rouen, and of Liège, which were thronged with the baronial clergy, and their multitudes of clerical attendants, and rich with the ornaments offered by pious kings and princes ; nor less the contrast with the gorgeous state of the wealthy monasteries, even the now splendid, almost luxurious Clugny. He was met at Clairvaux by the poor of Christ, not clad in purple and fine linen, but in tattered raiment ; not bearing Gospels or sacred books embossed in gold, but a rude stone

<sup>1</sup> "Episcoporum sibi restitui investituras, quas ab ejus prædecessore Imperatore Henrico, Romana Ecclesia vindicarat." — Ernold. Vit. Bernard.

<sup>2</sup> "Sed nec Leodii cervicibus imminens mureo barbaricus compulit acquiescere importunis improbisque postulationibus iracundi atque irascentis regis." — S. Bernard, Epist. 150. Bernard has rather overcharged the wrath of the meek Lothair.



cross. No trumpet sounded, no tumultuous shouts were heard ; no one lifted his looks from the earth, no curious eye wandered abroad to gaze on the ceremony ; the only sound was a soft and lowly chant. The Prelates and the Pope were moved to tears. The Roman clergy were equally astonished at the meanness of the Church furniture, the nakedness of the walls ; not less by the hardness and scantiness of the fare, the coarsest bread and vegetables, instead of the delicacies to which they were accustomed ; a single small fish had been procured for the Pope. They had little desire to sojourn long at Clairvaux.<sup>1</sup>

Bernard could boast that Innocent was now acknowledged, and chiefly through his influence, by the Kings of France, England, Spain, and by the Emperor. The more powerful clergy beyond the Alps, all the religious communities, the Camaldulites, the Vallombrosans, the Carthusians, those of Clugny, with other Benedictines ; his own Cistercians, in all their wide-spreading foundations, were on the same side. In Italy, the Archbishop of Ravenna, the Bishops of Pavia, Pistoia, Asti, and Parma, offered their allegiance. Of all the Sovereigns of Europe, Duke Roger of Sicily alone, bribed by the promise of a crown, adhered to his rival.

Bernard has now become an ardent, impassioned, disdainful partisan ; he has plunged heart and soul into the conflict and agitation of the world.<sup>2</sup> Anacletus

<sup>1</sup> Epist. 125.

<sup>2</sup> Bernard insists throughout on the canonical election of Innocent. In one place he doubtfully asserts the numbers to have been in favor of Innocent : "Cujus electio sanior numerum eligentium et numero vincens et merito." In other passages he rests the validity of the election altogether on the soundness of his adherents. It is the "dignitas eligentium. Hanc

had dared to send his legates into France: Aquitaine had generally espoused his cause. "Why not," writes the indignant Bernard to the Bishops of that province, "to Persia, to Decapolis, to the farthest Scythians?" Bernard's letters are addressed to the cities of Italy in terms of condescending praise and commanding authority rather than of meek persuasion. He exhorts them, Genoa more especially, which seemed to have been delighted with his presence, to reject the insidious alliance of the King of Sicily.<sup>1</sup> He threatens Milan, and hints that the Pope may raise bishops into archbishops, degrade archbishops into bishops. His power over the whole clergy knows no limitation. Bernard offers his mediation; but the price of reconciliation is not only submission to the spiritual power of Pope Innocent, but to the renunciation of Conrad, who still claimed the kingdom of Italy. They must make satisfaction, not to the Pope alone, but to the Emperor Lothair, the Pope's ally.<sup>2</sup>

The Emperor Lothair had promised to reinstate Innocent in the possession of Rome. Innocent entered Italy; he was received in Asti, Novara, Piacenza, Cremona, Brescia; he met the Emperor on the plains of Nov. 8, 1132. Roncaglia. From Piacenza he moved to Pisa, reconciled that city with her rising rival Genoa, and enim, ni fallor, partem saniozem invenies." — Epist. 126. "Electio meliorum, approbatio plurium, et quod hic efficacius est, morum attestatio, Innocentium apud omnes commendant, summum confirmant Pontificem." Consult these three epistles, of which the rhetoric is more powerful than the argument.

<sup>1</sup> "Habet tamen ducem Apuliæ, sed solum ex principibus, ipsumque usurpatæ coronæ mercede ridicula comparatum." — Anacletus had kept his compact, and advanced Roger to the kingdom of Sicily, Sept. 27, 1130. — Epist. 129 to 134. Some of these were written (Epist. 129) during Bernard's progress through Italy.

<sup>2</sup> Epist. 137, addressed to the Empress.

rewarded the obedience of Genoa by raising the see into an archbishopric. The fleets of Genoa March, 1133. and Pisa became the most useful allies of the Pope. The next year the Emperor and the Pope advanced to Rome, Bernard still by the side of the con- April 30. quering Pontiff. Anacletus did not venture to defend the city; he retired beyond the Tiber, occupied the Vatican, and maintained the Castle of St. Angelo. On either side of the river sat a Pope launching his interdict against his adversary. The Pope rewarded the Emperor's fidelity by crowning him and his Empress Richilda with great solemnity in the Lateran Church. Lothair swore to protect the Pope and the royalties of St. Peter to the utmost of his power; to en- June 4. force the restoration of all the rights and possessions withheld by violence from the See. But the presence of Lothair was the only safeguard of Innocent in Rome. No sooner had the Emperor returned to Germany than Innocent retired to Pisa, which, in St. Bernard's words, had the dignity of becoming a second Rome, the seat of exiled Pontiffs. Bernard was indignant at the long though necessary tardiness of the Emperor. It was not for him to excite to war, but it was for the Emperor to vindicate his throne from the Sicilian usurper; to defend the Church from the Jewish schismatic. His letter is that of a superior, under the guise of the lowest humility, dictating what is irrefragably right; in its address it is the supplication of a suitor; in its substance, in its spirit, a lofty reprimand.<sup>1</sup> He rebukes him for other weaknesses; for neglecting the interests of God by allowing the Church of St. Gingoulph to be oppressed; he rebukes him for his ingratitude to Pisa,

<sup>1</sup> Epist. 139, 140.

always the loyal subject and the most powerful ally of the Empire.

It was not till the fourth year of Innocent's retirement had begun (at Pisa<sup>1</sup> he exercised all the functions of a Pope, except over Rome and in the south of Italy), that Lothair appeared again under the Alps at the head of a formidable army. The Pope, at the head of one division, marched against the cities in the neighborhood of Rome; Lothair against the great ally of Anacletus, the King of Sicily. Lothair subdued the March of Ancona, the Principality of Capua, and almost the whole of Apulia. But this conquest endangered the amity between the Emperor and the Pope. Each claimed the right of investiture. Since the Norman conquest the Popes had maintained their strange claim to sovereignty over the whole kingdom of Naples; their right was grounded on the exercise of the right. The Emperor, as Emperor and King of Italy, declared himself undoubted sovereign of all which had not been expressly granted by his predecessors to the Holy See. A compromise took place; the new Duke Rainer swore fealty both to the Emperor and to the Pope. The King of Sicily had quietly withdrawn his troops, and waited his opportunity, when the Emperor should return to Germany,<sup>2</sup> to resume the offensive. Anacletus, in his impregnable fortress of St. Angelo, Jan. 25, 1133. defied his enemies. But his death relieved Innocent from his obstinate antagonist. The descendant of the Jew was buried secretly, lest his body, like that of Formosus, should be torn from its resting-

<sup>1</sup> Innocent was at Pisa from Nov. 16, 1133, to Feb. 28, 1137. He was on the plain of Roncaglia, Nov. 3, 1136.

<sup>2</sup> The Emperor Lothair died on his return to Germany, Dec. 3-4, 1137.

place by the vengeance of his enemies. An Antipope was elected two months after the death of Anacletus; he held his state but for <sup>March to May 29.</sup> two months more. For Innocent had returned to Rome, with Bernard by his side. Bernard, he himself declares, was constantly sighing for the quiet <sup>Jan. 12.</sup> shades of Clairvaux, for seclusion, for unworldly self-sanctification; but the interests of God and the commands of the Pope detained him, still reluctant, in the turmoil of secular affairs. His eloquence now wrought, perhaps, its greatest triumph; it prevailed over Roman faction and priestly ambition. Victor II., such was the name which the Cardinal-Priest Gregory had assumed with the Popedom, renounced his dignity; the powerful family of Peter the son of Leo abandoned the weary contest, and all Rome acknowledged the Pope of St. Bernard.

Never had Rome or any other city of Christendom beheld so numerous a council as that held by Innocent II. in the Lateran Palace on the 4th of April, 1139 — a thousand bishops (five from England), countless abbots, and other ecclesiastical dignitaries. The decrees have survived, not the debates of this Council. The speech of the Pope may be read; there is no record of those of Bernard and of the other ruling authorities. But the decrees, as well as the speech of Innocent, image forth the Christianity of the times, the Christianity of St. Bernard.

The oration of the Pope is remarkable, as distinctly claiming a feudal superiority over the whole clergy of Christendom. Every ecclesiastical dignity is held of him, as the great spiritual liege lord.<sup>1</sup> After inveigh-

<sup>1</sup> "Quia a Romani pontificis licentia ecclesiastici ordinis celsitudo, quasi



ing against the sacrilegious ambition of the Antipope, Innocent annulled all his decrees. "We degrade all whom he has promoted; we expel from holy orders and depose all whom he has consecrated." Those ordained by the legate of Anacletus, Gerard of Angoulême, were interdicted from their functions. Each of these degraded Prelates was summoned. The Pope assailed those that appeared with indignant reproaches, wrenched their pastoral staves out of their hands, himself stripped the palls from their shoulders, and without mercy took away the rings by which they were wedded to their churches.

The decrees of the Lateran Council, while the Pope asserted his own unlimited power over the episcopal order, gave to the bishops the same unlimited power over the lower clergy.<sup>1</sup> Even for irregular or unbecoming dress they might be deprived of their benefices. The marriage of subdeacons was strictly forbidden. A remarkable statute inhibited the prevailing usage of monks and regular canons practising law and medicine; the law, as tending not merely to withdraw them from their proper occupation of psalmody, but as confounding their notions of right and wrong, of justice and iniquity, and encouraging them to be avaricious of worldly gain. The same avidity for lucre led them to practise medicine, the knowledge of which could not be reconciled with the severe modesty of a monk.

Another significant canon betrayed that already a secret insurrection was brooding in the hearts of men against the sacerdotal authority of the Church. These

*feodalis juris consuetudine suscipitur, et sine ejus permissione legaliter non tenetur.*" — Chronicon. Maurin. apud Labbe.

<sup>1</sup> Decret. iv.

very times witnessed a formidable struggle against her wealth and power; and some bolder men had already begun to question her doctrines. The twenty-third canon of the Lateran Council might seem directed against the anabaptists of the 16th century. "We expel from the Church as heretics those who, under the semblance of religion, condemn the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, the baptism of children, the priesthood, and the holy rite of marriage." The heretics against whom this anathema was aimed will before long force themselves on our notice.

The legislation of the Lateran Council did not confine itself to the affairs of the clergy, or, strictly speaking, of religion. The Council assumed the office of conservator of the public morals and the public peace. It condemned usurers and incendiaries. It repeated the enactment demanding security at all times for certain classes, the clergy of all orders, monks, pilgrims, merchants, and rustics employed in agriculture, with their beasts, their seed, and their flocks. The Truce of God was to be observed on the appointed days under peril of excommunication; after a third admonition excommunication followed, which if the clergy did not respect, they were to be degraded from their orders. The persons of the clergy were taken under especial protection. It was sacrilege to strike a clergyman or a monk — a sacrilege, the penalty of which could only be absolved on the death-bed. A rigid decree prohibited tournaments as a vain display of strength and valor, and as leading to bloodshed. Another singular decree condemned the use of the cross-bow against Christians and Catholics as an act deadly and hateful to God.

This solemn Christian protest against the habits of a warlike age, as might be expected, had no immediate or visible effect : yet still as a protest it may have worked in the depths of the Christian mind, if not absolutely compelling its observance, yet giving weight and authority to kindred thoughts in reflective minds ; at all events, rescuing Christianity from the imputation of a total forgetfulness of its genuine spirit, an utter extinction of its essential character.

In that strange discordance indeed which is so embarrassing in ecclesiastical history, almost all the few remaining years of Innocent II., the great pacificator, are occupied in war. He is heading his own armies, first against Tusculum and other rebellious cities in the neighborhood of Rome ; then in an obstinate war against the King of Sicily. It would be curious, if it were possible, to ascertain how far the papal troops respected the monk and the pilgrim, the merchant and the husbandman ; how far they observed the solemn days of the Truce of God. In these unseemly martial expeditions the popes were singularly unfortunate, yet their disasters almost always turned to their advantage. Like his predecessor Leo IX., Innocent fell, as a prisoner of war, into the hands of his enemies. Again the awe-struck Norman bowed before his holy captive ; and Innocent as a prisoner obtained better terms than he would have won at the point of the sword.

## CHAPTER V.

## GOTSCHALK — ABELARD.

THE papacy is again united in the person of Innocent II., but the work of the real Supreme Pontiff of Christendom, of the ruling mind of the West, is but half achieved. Bernard must be followed to other conquests, to other victories; victories which for some centuries left their influence upon mankind, and arrested the precocious, irregular, and perilous struggles for intellectual and spiritual, and even civil freedom.

Monastic Christianity led to two unexpected but inevitable results, to the expansion of the human understanding, even till it strove to overleap the lofty barriers of the established Catholic doctrine, and to a sullen and secret mutiny, at length to an open insurrection, against the power of the sacerdotal order. The former revolt was not only premature, but suppressed without any immediate outburst menacing to the stability of the dominant creed and institutions. It was confined not indeed to a few, for the schools of those whom the Church esteemed the most dangerous teachers were crowded with young and almost fanatical hearers. But it was a purely intellectual movement. The Church raised up on her side as expert and powerful dialecticians as those who strove for emancipation. Wherever philosophy aspired to be

Two great  
intellectual  
movements  
begin.

independent of theology, it was seized and carried captive back. Nor did the Church by any means exclusively maintain her supremacy by stern and imperious authority, by proscribing and suppressing inquiry. Though she did not disdain, she did not entirely rely on fixing the infamy of heretical doctrine upon the more daring reasoners; she reasoned herself by her sons with equal vigor, if with more submissiveness; sounded with her antagonists the depths of metaphysical inquiry, examined the inexhaustible processes of human thought and language, till gradually the gigantic bulwark of scholastic theology rose around the Catholic doctrine.

Of this first movement, the intellectual struggle for emancipation, Abélard was the representative and the victim. Of the second, far more popular, immediate, and while it lasted, perilous, that which rose up against the whole hierarchical system of Christendom, the champion was Arnold of Brescia. This last was for a time successful; combining with the inextinguishable republican spirit of the Roman populace, it curbed and subjugated the great head of the hierarchy in the very seat of his power. It required a league between a powerful Emperor and an able Pope to crush Arnold of Brescia; but in the ashes of Arnold of Brescia's funeral pile smouldered for centuries the fire, which was at length to blaze out in irresistible violence.

Both these movements sprang naturally out of monastic Christianity; it is necessary to trace the birth of each in succession from this unsuspected and unsuspecting origin. It was impossible, even in the darkest times, to seclude a large part of mankind from the active duties of life without driving, as it were, some



into intellectual occupation. Conventual discipline might enslave or absorb the greater number by its perpetual round of ritual observance ; by the distribution of day and night into short portions, to each of which belonged its prayer, its maceration, its religious exercise. It might induce in most a religious terror, a fearful shrinking of the spirit from every possibly unlawful aberration of the mind, as from any unlawful emotion of the body. The coarser and more sluggish minds would be altogether ice-bound in the alternation of hard labor and unvarying religious service. They would rest contented in mechanical drudgery in the field, and as mechanical religion in the chapel. The calmer and more imaginative would surrender themselves to a dreamy ecstasy of devotion. Mysticism, in some one of its forms, would absorb all their energies of mind, all their aspirations of heart. Meditation with them might be one long, unbroken, unceasing adoration, the more indistinct the more awful, the more awful the more reverential ; and that reverence would suppress at once any question bordering on presumption. Submission to authority, the vital principle of monasticism, would be a part of their being. Yet with some contemplation could not but lead to thought ; meditation would quicken into reflection ; reflection, however checked by authority and restrained by dread, would still wander away, would still strive against its barriers. The being and the attributes of God, the first prescribed subject of holy contemplation, what were they ? Where was the bound, the distinction, between things visible and things invisible ? things material and things immaterial ? the real and the unreal ? the finite and the infinite ? The very object which was continually

enforced upon the mind by its most sublime attribute, the incomprehensibility of God, tempted the still baffled but unwearied desire of comprehension. Reason awoke, composed itself again to despairing slumber on the lap of authority; awoke again; its slumbers became more disturbed, more irregular, till the anodyne of awe had lost its power. Religion itself seemed to compel to metaphysical inquiry; and the region of metaphysical inquiry once expanding on the view, there was no retreat. Reason no sooner began to cope with these inevitable subjects, than it was met on the threshold by the great question, the existence of a world inapprehensible by our senses, and that of the mode of its apprehension by the mind. This great unanswerable problem appears destined to endure as long as mankind; but no sooner was it started and followed out by the contemplative monk, than from an humble disciple of the Gospel he became a philosopher; he was, perhaps, an unconscious Aristotelian, or an unconscious Platonist. But in truth the tradition of neither philosophy had absolutely died out. Among the few secular books which survived the wreck of learning and found their way into the monastic libraries, were some which might foster the bias either to the more rational or more ideal view.<sup>1</sup>

So in every insurrection, whether religious or more philosophical, against the dominant dogmatic system, a monk was the leader, and there had been three or four of these insurrections before the time of Abélard. Even early in the ninth century the German monk Gotschalk had revived the dark subject of predestination. This subject had almost slept since the time of Augustine

<sup>1</sup> The *Isagoge* of Porphyrius; the works of Boethius.

and his scholar Fulgentius, who had relentlessly crushed the Semi-Pelagianism of his day.<sup>1</sup> It is a singular circumstance, as has been before shown, that this religious fatalism has been so constantly the creed or rather the moving principle of those who have risen up against established ecclesiastical authority, while an established religion tends constantly to acquiesce in a less inflexible view of divine providence. The reason is simple and twofold. Nothing less than a stern fanaticism, which makes the reformer believe himself under the direct guidance, a mere instrument, predestined by God's providence for this work, would give courage to confront a powerful hierarchy, to meet obloquy, persecution, even martyrdom; the same fanaticism, by awakening a kindred conviction of an absolute and immediate call from God, gives hope of a successful struggle at least, if not of victory; he is pre-doomed or specially commissioned and avowed by the Most High. On the other hand an hierarchy is naturally averse to a theory which involves the direct and immediate operation of God by an irreversible decree upon each individual mind. Assuming itself to be the intermediate agency between God and man, and resistance to its agency being the sure and undeniable consequence of the tenet, it cannot but wish to modify or mitigate that predestination which it does not altogether reject. It is perpetually appealing to the free-will of man by its offers of the means of grace; as the guide and spiritual director of each individual soul, it will not be superseded

<sup>1</sup> It is curious that the first heresy, after the *establishment* of Mohammedanism, was the denial, or questioning at least, of predestinarianism. "A peine le prophète était mort qu'une dispute s'éleva entre les théologiens sur le dogme de Prédestination." — Schmolder's *Essai*, p. 192. See also Ritter, *Christliche Philosophie*, p. 693.

by an anterior and irrevocable law. Predestination, in its extreme theory at least, disdains all the long, slow, and elaborate work of the Church, in training, watching, controlling, and submitting to ecclesiastical discipline, the soul committed to its charge. The predestinarian, though in fact (such is the logical inconsistency of strong religious belief) by no means generally antinomian, is always represented and indeed believed to be antinomian by those from whose rigid authority this primary tenet emancipates the disciple. So it was that the Transalpine hierarchy, under the ruling influence of Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, who at one time possessed almost papal authority, persecuted the Predestinarian as a dangerous and lawless heretic; and Gotschalk endured the censure of a council, the scourge, the prison, with stubborn and determined confidence, not merely that he was fulfilling his divine mission, but that in him the Church condemned the true doctrine of the irrefragable Augustine.<sup>1</sup>

Hincmar called to his aid, against this premature  
Scotus Luther, an ally who alarmed the Church no  
Erigena. less than Gotschalk himself by his appeal to  
 a new power above Catholic authority, human reason. We have already encountered this extraordinary

<sup>1</sup> Gotschalk stands so much alone, that I thought it not necessary, during the age of Hincmar, to arrest the course of events by the discussion of his views. His tenets may be seen in one sentence from his own works in Hincmar's *De Prædestinatione*: "Quia sicut Deus incommutabilis ante mundi constitutionem omnes electos suos incommutabiliter per gratuitam gratiam suam prædestinavit ad vitam æternam, similiter omnino omnes reprobos, qui in die judicii damnabuntur propter ipsorum mala merita, idem ipse incommutabilis Deus per justum judicium suum incommutabiliter prædestinavit ad mortem merito sempiternam." In Archbishop Usher's works will be found the whole controversy. — *Gotteschalci et Prædestinatiariæ Controversiæ ab eo motæ Historia*. See also the *Lectures of M. Ampère*.

man as the spiritual ancestor, the parent of Berengar of Tours and of his anti-transubstantiation doctrine. A sudden revulsion took place. Hincmar, by his overweening pride and pretensions to supremacy, at least over the whole Church of France, had awakened a strong jealousy among the great prelates of the realm. Prudentius of Troyes took the lead against him; and though eventually Gotschalk died in a prison, yet Hincmar became a tyrannical persecutor, wellnigh a heretic, Gotschalk an injured victim, if not a martyr. This fatal ally of Hincmar was the famous John, commonly called Erigena.

Perhaps the only fact which may be considered certain as to the early years of John the Erin-born is, that he must have commenced at least this train of philosophic thought in some one of the monastic schools of Ireland or of the Scottish islands. In some secluded monastery among those last retreats of knowledge which had escaped the Teutonic invasion, or on the wave-beat shore of Iona, John the Scot imbibed that passion for knowledge which made him an acceptable guest at Paris, the partner of the table and even of the bed of Charles the Bald.<sup>1</sup> Throughout those wild and turbulent times of Charles the Bald Erigena lived undisturbed by the civil wars which raged around, resolutely detached from secular affairs, not in monastic but in intellectual seclusion. John is said to have made a pilgrimage, not to the birthplace of the Saviour, but to that of Plato and Aristotle;<sup>2</sup> and it is difficult to

<sup>1</sup> Hence the anecdote, true or false, of his famous repartee to the King, "Quid distat inter Scotum et sotum?—mensa."

<sup>2</sup> Brucker thinks that John's knowledge of Greek gave rise to this report of his travels to the East.



imagine where in the West he can have obtained such knowledge of Greek as to enable him to translate the difficult and mystic work which bore the name of Dionysius the Areopagite.<sup>1</sup> John the Scot professed an equal admiration for the antagonistic philosophies of Plato and of Aristotle; he even attempted the yet unaccomplished, perhaps the impossible, task of reconciling the poetry and prose of the two systems. In his treatise on Predestination he boldly asserts the supremacy of Reason; he throws off, what no Latin before had dared, the fetters of Augustinianism. His free-will is even more than the plain practical doctrine of Chrysostom and the Greek Fathers, who avoided or eluded that inscrutable question: it is an attempt to found it on philosophic grounds, to establish it on the sublime arbitration of human reason. In his translation of Dionysius the Areopagite with the Commentary of Maximus, Erigena taught the mysticism of the later Platonists. He aspired to the still higher office of harmonizing philosophy with religion, which in their loftiest sense he declared to be the same.<sup>2</sup> Thus John the Scot was at once a strong Ration-

<sup>1</sup> Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury, himself a Greek, had given a temporary impulse to the study of the language. It will be seen that two centuries later the universal Abélard was ignorant of Greek; and I doubt whether his fair pupil understood more than her master.

<sup>2</sup> Erigena's most remarkable work bears a Greek title, *περὶ φύσεως μερισμοῦ*, published by Gale, Oxford, 1681; recently by M. Schruter, Munster, 1838. On this book compare Haureau, *De la Philosophie Scholastique* (an admirable treatise), p. 112, *et seq.* "Quel étonnement, disons même quel respect, doit nous inspirer la grande figure de ce docteur, qui causera tant d'agitation dans l'école, dans l'Eglise; qui semera les vents, et recueillera les tempêtes, mais saura les braver; qui ne laissera pas un héritier direct de sa doctrine, mais qui du moins aura la gloire d'avoir annoncé, d'avoir précédé Bruno, Vanini, Spinoza, les plus téméraires des logiciens qui aient jamais erré sous les platanes de l'Académie." See also the Lectures of M. Ampère.

alist (he brings all theologic questions to the test of dialectic reasoning); and at the same time, not by remote inference, but plainly and manifestly a Pantheist. With him God is all things, all things are God. The Creator alone truly *is*; the universe is but a sublime Theophany, a visible manifestation of God. He distinctly asserts the eternity of the universe; his dialectic proof of this he proclaims to be irresistible. Creation could not have been an accident of the Deity; it is of his essence to be a cause: all things therefore have existed, do exist, and will exist through him their cause. All things flow from the infinite abyss of the Godhead, and are reabsorbed into it.<sup>1</sup> No wonder that, notwithstanding the profound devotion which John the Scot blended with his most daring speculations, and the valuable service which he rendered to the Church, especially by his confutation, on however perilous grounds, yet which the foes of the predestinarian alleged to be a full confutation of the predestinarian Gotschalk, he was met by a loud and hostile clamor. Under the general denunciation of the Church and of the Pope, Nicolas I., he was obliged to fly to England: there he is said to have taken refuge in Alfred's new University of Oxford.<sup>2</sup> But if by his bolder speculations John the Scot appalled his age, by his

<sup>1</sup> Compare Brucker, vol. iii. p. 618, Schmidt der *Mysticismus der Mittel Alter*. See also Guizot, *Civilis. Moderne*, Lec. 29; Rousselot, *Etudes sur la Philosophie dans le Moyen Age*, cap. 2. John Scot had in distinct terms the "*cogito, ergo sum*" of Descartes; but in fact he took it from Augustine. — Haureau, p. 133. Compare Ritter, ii. p. 186. We may return to John Scot.

<sup>2</sup> The account of his death is borrowed by Matthew of Westminster from that of a later John the Saxon, who was stabbed by some monks in a quarrel. The flight to England does not depend on the truth of that story.

translation of Dionysius the Areopagite he compensated to the monastic system as supplying to the dreamy and meditative a less lawless and more absorbing train of thought, a more complete, more satisfactory, yet inoffensive mysticism to the restless mind.<sup>1</sup> What could be more congenial to the recluse, who aspired beyond the daily routine of toil and psalmody, than this vision of the Godhead, this mystic union with the Supreme, the emancipation of the soul from its corporal prison-house, the aspiration to, the absorption in, the primal fountain of light and blessedness, the attainable angelic, and higher than angelic perfection, the ascent through all the gradations of the celestial hierarchy up to the visible at once and invisible throne of God? The effect of this work on the whole ecclesiastic system, and on the popular faith, it is almost impossible justly to estimate. The Church of France had now made it a point of their national and monastic honor to identify the St. Denys, the founder and patron saint of the church at Paris, with the Areopagite of St. Paul; to them there could be no gift so acceptable, none so greedily received. But when the whole hierarchy found that they, each in their ascending order, were the image of an ascending hierarchical type in heaven; that each order, culminating in the Pope,<sup>2</sup> was the representative of a celestial order culminating in the Supreme; this was too flattering to their pride and to their power not to become at once orthodox and ecclesiastical doctrine. The effect of this new angel-

<sup>1</sup> William of Malmesbury says of Erigena: "Si tamen ignoscatur ei in aliquibus, in quibus a Latinorum tramite deviavit, dum in Græcos acriter oculos intendit." — P. 190, N. S. edit.

<sup>2</sup> See, however, vol. vi. This tenet would be added in the West.

ology on the popular belief, on the arts, and on the imagination of Latin Christendom, will be more fully developed in our consideration of the rise and progress of Christian mythology.

Though an outcast and an exile, John the Scot maintained such authority on account of his transcendent learning, that in the second great rebellion, not merely against the supremacy but almost the life of the mediæval system, Berengar of Tours appealed to him as one whose name, whose intimacy with Charles the Bald, ought to overawe the puny opponents of his time. He seems to have thought, he fearlessly and repeatedly asserted even so learned and renowned a prelate as Lanfranc to be presumptuous in not bowing at once to the decisions of John the Scot.

As time rolled on, these speculations were no longer working only in the minds of solitary men, often no doubt when least suspected. They were not promulgated, as those of Gotschalk had been, by public preaching; even those of Berengar had gained their full publicity in the schools which were attached to many of the greater monasteries. In these schools, the parents of our modern universities, the thought which had been brooded over, and perhaps suppressed in the silence of the cloister, found an opportunity of suggesting itself for discussion, of commanding a willing, often a numerous, auditory; and was quickened by the collision of adverse opinion. The recluse and meditative philosopher became a teacher, the head of a new philosophy. Dialectics, the science of logic, was one of the highest, if not the highest, intellectual study. It was part of the Quadrivium, the more advanced and perfect stage of public education; and under the

specious form of dialectic exercises, the gravest questions of divinity became subjects of debate. Thus began to rise a new Christian theology; not that of the Church embodied in the devout forms of the Liturgy, and enforced in the simple or more impassioned discourse from the pulpit; not that of the thoughtful divine, following out his own speculations in their natural course; but that of the disputant, bound by conventional scientific forms, with a tendency to degenerate from a severe investigation of truth into a trial of technical skill. In its highest tone acute, ingenious, and subtile, it presented every question in every possible form; it was comprehensive so as to embrace the most puerile and frivolous as well as the most momentous and majestic inquiries; if dry, wearisome, unawakening in its form, as litigation and as a strife of contending minds, it became of intense interest. It was the intellectual tournament of a small intellectual aristocracy, to which all the scholars who were bred to more peaceful avocations thronged in multitudes.

The strife between the Nominalists and Realists, famous names, which to the schools were as the Guelfs and Ghibellines in the politics of Europe, was one of the first inevitable results of this importance assumed by the science of dialectics. It is difficult to translate this controversy out of its logical language, and to make it clearly intelligible to the popular apprehension; nor is it immediately apparent how the fundamental truths of Christianity, of religion itself, as the jealous and sensitive vigilance of the hierarchy could not but perceive, were involved in this dispute. The doctrine and fate of Roscelin, the first great Nominalist, the authoritative interpreter if not the author of the system,



show at once the character and the fears excited by Nominalism. Roscelin peremptorily denied the real existence of universals; nothing actually *is* but the individual, that of which the senses take immediate cognizance. Universals were mere conventional phrases. Each animal subsists; the animal race is but an aggregate of the thought; man lives, humankind is a creation of the mind; the inherent, distinctive, accidental qualities of things are inseparable from the objects to which they belong. He even denied the proper existence of parts, the whole alone had actual being; it was divided or analyzed only by an effort of reflection. Though the materializing tendency of Roscelin's doctrine was clearly discerned<sup>1</sup> and sternly denounced by his adversaries, yet Roscelin himself did not absolutely deny the reality of the invisible, immaterial world: the souls of men, the angels, the Deity, were to him unquestioned beings. This appears even from the fatal syllogism which awoke the jealousy of the Church, and led to the proscription of Roscelin. For philosophy could not stand aloof from theology, and Roscelin was too bold or too consistent not to push his system into that forbidden domain. The statement of his opinions rests on the evidence of his adversary, but that adversary, Anselm, cites his own words, and in a form likely to have been used by so fearless a dialectician. While he reasoned of the Godhead as if having no doubt of its real being, his own concessions seemed of necessity to perplex or to destroy the doctrine of the Trinity.

<sup>1</sup> "In eorum (the Nominalists) quippe animabus, ratio, quæ et princeps et iudex omnium debet esse quæ sunt in homine, sic est in imaginationibus corporalibus obvoluta, ut ex eis se non possit evolvere; nec ab ipsis ea quæ ipsa sola et pura contemplari debet, valeat discernere." — Anselm, apud Rousselot.

If the three persons are one thing and not three things, as distinct as three angels or three souls, though one in will and power, the Father and the Holy Ghost must have been incarnate with the Son.<sup>1</sup>

It was a churchman, but a churchman bred in a monastery, who in the quiet of its cloisters had long sounded the depths of metaphysical inquiry and was practised in its schools, one really compelled to leave his contemplative seclusion to mingle in worldly affairs — Anselm, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, who rose up to denounce and confute at once the heretical logic and heretical theology of Roscelin.

The Norman abbey of Bec seemed to aspire to that same præminence in theologic learning and the accomplishments of high-minded churchmen which the Normans were displaying in valor, military skill, and the conquests of kingdoms. The Normans had founded or subdued great monarchies at each extreme of Europe. Normans sat on the thrones of Sicily and England. From the Norman abbey of Bec came forth two archbishops of England, the champions of the Catholic doctrine, one, Lanfranc, against Berengar of Tours, the other, Anselm, the triumphant adversary of Roscelin, and, if not the founder, the precursor of the scholastic theology. The monastery of Bec had been founded by Herluin, a fierce and ignorant knight, who toiled and prayed as a monk with the same vehemence with which he had fought as a warrior. Herluin, accustomed to head a band of savage

The abbey  
of Bec.

<sup>1</sup> "Si in Deo tres personæ sunt una tantum res, et non sunt tres res, unaquæque per se separatim, sicut tres angeli, aut tres animæ, ita tamen ut voluntate et potentiâ sint idem, ergo Pater et Spiritus Sanctus cum Filio incarnatus est." — Anselm de fid. Trinit., Rousselot, t. i. p. 160.

freebooters, suddenly seized with a paroxysm of devotion, had become the head of a religious brotherhood, in which the no less savage austerity made a profound impression upon his countrymen, and obtained for it that fame for rigid discipline which led the Italian Lanfranc, as afterwards the Italian Anselm, to its walls.<sup>1</sup> It is true that the great theologians of Bec were strangers by birth, but they were adopted Normans, called to Norman sees, and protected by Norman kings.

The profound devotion of his age was the all-absorbing passion of Anselm.<sup>2</sup> The monastery was Anselm's home; when he was forced into the Primate's throne of England, his heart was still in the quiet abbey of Bec. In his philosophy, as in his character, Faith was the priest, who stood alone in the sanctuary of his heart; Reason, the awe-struck and reverential minister was to seek satisfaction not for the doubts (for from doubts Anselm would have recoiled as from treason against God), but for those grave questionings, how far and in what manner the harmony was to be established between the Godhead of Revelation and of Reason. The theology of the Church, in all its most imperious dogmatism, was the irrefragable truth from which Anselm set out. It was not timidity, or even awe, which kept him within the barriers; his mind intuitively shrunk from all without those bounds, excepting so far as profound thought might seem to elucidate and make

<sup>1</sup> Compare throughout C. Rémusat, *Anselme*. This excellent book has appeared since the greater part of my work was written; the whole indeed of this passage. See also the treatises of Anselm, many of them separately republished; Frank, *Anselm von Canterbury*; Mühler, *Anselm*; Bouchette.

<sup>2</sup> Anselm will appear again in his high sacerdotal character as Archbishop of Canterbury.

more clear the catholic conceptions of the Godhead and of the whole invisible world. His famous philosophical axiom, which alone perpetuated his renown during the centuries which looked with contempt on the intellectual movements of the middle ages, the *a priori* proof of the being of God — “The idea of God in the mind of man is the one unanswerable evidence of the existence of God” — this with Anselm was an illustration rather than the groundwork of his theology. It was not the discovery of God, whom his soul had from its earliest dawn implicitly believed, whom his heart had from his youth upward loved with intense devotion; it was not even a satisfaction of his craving intellect (his intellect required no satisfaction); it was the bright thought which flashed across the reflective mind, or to which it was led by the slow gradations of reasoning.<sup>1</sup> Faith condescended to knowledge, not because faith was insufficient, but because knowledge was, as it were, in the contemplative mind a necessary fruit of faith. He could not understand unless he first believed. But the intellect, which had for so many centuries slumbered on the lap of religion, or at least only aspired to activity on subjects far below these primary and elemental truths; which when it fought, fought for the outworks of the creed, and left the citadel, or rather (for, as in Jerusalem, the Temple was the fortress as well as the fane) the Holy of Holies, to be guarded by its own inherent sanctity; — the intellect however awakened with reverential hand, once stirred, could not compose

<sup>1</sup> “*Neque enim quæro intelligere, ut credam, sed credo ut intelligam. Nam et hoc credo, quia nisi credidero, non intelligam.*” — Prolog., c. iv. “*Gratias tibi, bone Domine, gratias tibi: quia quod prius credidi te docente; jam sic intelligo te illuminante, ut si te esse nolim credere, non possem non intelligere.*”

itself to the same profound repose. Anselm unconsciously, being absolutely himself without fear and without danger, had entered ; and if he did not first throw open, had expanded wide the doors of that region of metaphysical inquiry which others would hereafter tread with bolder steps. Questions which he touched with holy dread were soon to be vexed by ruder hands. Reason had received an admission which, however timidly, she would never cease to assert.

It may appear at first singular that the thought which suggested itself to the mind of a monk at Bec should still be the problem of metaphysical theology ; and theology must, when followed out, become metaphysical ; metaphysics must become theological. This same thought seems, with no knowledge of its mediæval origin, to have forced itself on Descartes, was reasserted by Leibnitz, if not rejected was thought insufficient by Kant, revived in another form by Schelling and by Hegel ; latterly has been discussed with singular fullness and ingenuity by M. de Rémusat. Yet will it less surprise the more profoundly reflective, who cannot but perceive how soon and how inevitably the mind arrives at the verge of human thought ; how it cannot but encounter this same question, which in another form divided in either avowed or unconscious antagonism, Plato and Aristotle, Anselm and his opponents (for opponents he had of no common subtilty), Leibnitz and Locke ; which Kant failed to reconcile ; which his followers have perhaps bewildered by a new and intricate phraseology more than elucidated ; which modern eclecticism harmonizes rather in seeming than in reality ; the question of questions ; our primary, elemental, it may be innate or instinctive, or acquired



and traditional, idea, conception, notion, conviction of God, of the Immaterial, the Eternal, the Infinite.

Anselm, at first by his secluded monastic habits, afterwards on account of his dignity as Archbishop of Canterbury, and the part which he was compelled to take in the quarrel about investitures in England, either shrunk from or stood above the personal conflicts which involved other metaphysicians in active hostilities. Yet, however the schools might already have been startled by theories of alarming import (the more alarming, since few could foresee their ultimate end), so far, without doubt, in all these conflicts between the intellectual and religious development of man, in these first insurrections against the autocracy of the Church, as regards its power over the public mind, the Church had come forth triumphant. Its adversaries had been awed, it might be into sullen and reluctant silence, yet into silence. Even in the strife between Abélard and St. Bernard it seemed to maintain the same superiority.

The life of Abélard, contrasted with that of St. Bernard, gives, as it were, the full measure and perfect image of the time in its intellectual as in its religious development.

Peter Abélard was a Breton (a native of Palais, about four leagues from Nantes). In him were centred the characteristics of that race,<sup>1</sup> the uncontrollable impetuosity, the individuality, which delighted in isolation from the rest of mankind, the

Abélard born  
A.D. 1079.

<sup>1</sup> On Abélard, see above all his own works (the first volume of a new edition has appeared, by M. Cousin), more especially the *Historia Calamitatum* and the *Letters*. The *Sic et Non* edited, with reservations, by M. Cousin; more completely by Henke. — Rousselot, *Etudes*; C. de Rémusat, *Abélard*.

self-confidence which swelled into arrogance, the perseverance which hardened into obstinacy, the quickness and fertility which were speedily fostered into a passion for disputation. His education ripened with unexampled rapidity his natural character; no man is so overbearing or so stubborn as a successful disputant; and very early in life Abélard became the most powerful combatant in the intellectual tilting matches of the schools, which had now become one of the great fashions of the day. His own words show the singular analogy between the two paths of distinction open to aspiring youth. "I preferred," said Abélard, "the strife of disputations to the trophies of war." Skill in dialectics became to the young churchman what the management of the lance and of the courser was to the knight. He descended into the lists, and challenged all comers; and those lists, in the peaceful conventual schools, were watched with almost as absorbing interest by spectators hardly less numerous. Before the age of twenty Abélard had wandered through great part of France as an errant logician, and had found no combatant who could resist his prowess. He arrived in Paris, where the celebrated William of Cham-<sup>About</sup>peaux was at the height of his fame. The <sup>A.D. 1100.</sup> schools of Paris, which afterwards expanded into that renowned University, trembled at the temerity of the youth who dared to encounter that veteran in dialectic warfare, whose shield had been so long untouched, and who had seemed secure in his all-acknowledged puissance. Abélard in a short time was the pupil, the rival, the conqueror, and of course an object of implacable animosity to the vanquished chieftain of the schools. To have been the master of Abélard might

seem, indeed, to insure his rebellion. He seized at once on the weak parts of his teacher's system, and in his pride of strength scrupled not to trample him in the dust. Abélard had once been the pupil of Roscelin; he denounced, refuted Nominalism. He was now the hearer of William of Champeaux; the peculiar Realism which William taught met with no more respect. Notwithstanding the opposition of his master, he set up a rival school, first, under the favor of the Court, at Melun, afterwards at Corbeil, nearer Paris. A domestic affliction, the death of his beloved mother, sent him back to Brittany, where he remained some short time. On his return he renewed the attempt to dethrone William of Champeaux, and succeeded in drawing off all his scholars. The philosopher, in disgust at his empty hall, retired into a brotherhood of black canons. Abélard assumed his chair. The Court interest, and perhaps the violence of some older and still faithful disciples of William of Champeaux, expelled him from his usurped seat. He retired again to Melun, and reëstablished his rival school. But on the final retirement of William of Champeaux from Paris, Abélard returned to the city; and notwithstanding that William himself came back to support his appointed successor, a general desertion of his pupils left Abélard in undisputed supremacy. William of Champeaux was consoled for his discomfiture by the Bishopric of Châlons.

But there was one field alone for the full, complete, and commanding development of dialectic skill, which had now to a certain extent drawn itself apart into a distinct and separate camp: philosophy was no longer, as with Anselm, one with divinity. That field was

theology. This was the single, all-engrossing subject, which the disputant could not avoid, and which alone, through the Church or the monastery, led to permanent fame, repose, wealth, or power. As yet Abélard had kept prudently aloof, as far as was possible, from that sacred and uncongenial domain. For Abélard had no deep devotional training, no severe discipline, no habits of submission. He might aspire remotely to the dignity, honor, or riches of the churchman, but he had nothing of the hierarchical spirit, no reverence for rigid dogmatic orthodoxy; he stood alone in his conscious strength, consorted not intimately with the ecclesiastics, espoused not ostentatiously their interests, perhaps betrayed contempt of their ignorance. Of the monk he had still less; whatever love of solitude he might indulge, was that of philosophic contemplation, not of religious or mystic meditation. His place in the convent was not the chapel at midnight or before the break of morning; his was not either the richly-intoned voice swelling the full harmony of the choir, or the tender orison of the humble and weeping penitent. Of his fasts, of his mortifications, of his self-torture, nothing is heard. His place is in the adjacent school, where he is perplexing his antagonists with his dexterous logic, or losing them with himself in the depths of his subtle metaphysics. Yet the fame at least of theologic erudition is necessary to crown his glory; he must be profoundly learned, as well as irresistibly argumentative. He went to Laon to study under Anselm, the most renowned theologian of his day. The fame of this Anselm survives only in the history of Abélard — lost, perhaps, in that of his greater namesake, now dead for many years. With

more than his characteristic temerity and arrogance, he treated Anselm even less respectfully than he had treated William of Champeaux. He openly declared the venerable divine to owe his fame to his age rather than to his ability or knowledge. Abélard began at once to lecture in opposition to his master on the Prophet Ezekiel. His renown was now at its height; there was no branch of knowledge on which Abélard did not believe himself, and was not believed, competent to give the fullest instruction. Not merely did all Paris and the adjacent districts throng to his school, but there was no country so remote, no road so difficult, but that the pupils defied the toils and perils of the way. From barbarous Anjou, from Poitou, Gascony, and Spain, from Normandy, Flanders, Germany, Swabia, from England notwithstanding the terrors of the sea, scholars of all ranks and classes crowded to Paris. Even Rome, the great teacher of the world in all arts and sciences, acknowledged the superior wisdom of Abélard, and sent her sons to submit to his discipline.

The romance of Abélard's life commenced when it  
Heloisa. usually begins to languish in others; that romance, so singularly displaying the manners, habits, and opinions of the time, becomes grave history. He was nearer forty than thirty when the passions of youth, which had hitherto been controlled by habits of severe study, came upon him with sudden and unresisted violence. No religious scruples seem to have interposed. The great philosopher, though as yet only an ecclesiastic in dignity, and destined for the sacred function, a canon of the Church, calmly determines to reward himself for his long continence. Yet his fastidious feelings



loathed the more gross and vulgar sensualities. His studies had kept him aloof from the society of high-born ladies ; yet, as he asserts, and as Heloisa in the fervor of her admiration scruples not to confirm his assertion, there was no female, however noble in birth or rank, or spotless in fame, who would have scrupled to receive the homage and reward the love of Abélard. Though Abélard was looking out, like a gallant knight, for a mistress of his affections, there was nothing chivalrous or reverential in his passion for Heloisa. He deliberately planned the seduction of this maiden, who was no less distinguished for her surpassing beauty than for her wonderful talents and knowledge. He offered to board in the house of her uncle, the Canon Fulbert, in order that he might cultivate to the utmost the mind of this accomplished damsel. The avarice and vanity of the uncle were equally tempted ; without suspicion he made over his niece to the absolute authority of the teacher, permitting him even to inflict personal chastisement.

Abélard's new passion only developed more fully his wonderful faculties. The philosopher and theologian became a poet and a musician. The lovers made no attempt at the concealment of their mutual attachment. All Paris admired the beautiful amatory verses of Abélard, which were allowed to transpire ; and Heloisa, in the deep devotion of her love, instead of shrinking from the breath of public fame, thought herself an object of envy to all her sex. The Canon Fulbert alone was ignorant that he had intrusted, in Abélard's own words, " his spotless lamb to a ravening wolf." When the knowledge was at last forced upon

him, Heloisa fled with her lover in the disguise of a nun, and in the house of his sister in Brittany, gave birth to a son, whom he called by the philosophic name of Astrolabius.<sup>1</sup> The indignant Canon insisted on the reparation of his family honor by marriage. Abélard consented; Heloisa alone, in an absolute, unrivalled spirit of self-devotion, so wonderful that we forget to reprove, resisted; she used every argument, every appeal to the pride, the honor, even to the love of Abélard, which are usually urged to enforce that atonement, to dissuade her lover from a step so fatal to his fame and his advancement. As a philosopher Abélard would be trammelled by the vulgar cares of a family; as a churchman his career of advancement, which might soar to the highest place, was checked at once and forever. Moral impediments might be got over, canonical objections were insuperable; he might stand above all but the inexorable laws of the Church through his transcendent abilities. Though she had been, though she might be still his mistress, she did not thereby incapacitate him for any high dignity; as his wife she closed against him that ascending ladder of ecclesiastical honors, the priorate, the abbacy, the bishopric, the metropolitanate, the cardinalate, and even that which was beyond and above all. There was no place to which Abélard, as her heart and mind assured her the first of men, might not reasonably, rightfully aspire, and was

<sup>1</sup> M. Cousin (*Nouveaux Fragments Philosophiques*, vol. ii.) has published a long Latin poem addressed to his son by Abélard. It is in part a versification of the Book of Proverbs. Of the life of Astrolabius nothing is known. M. Cousin found this singular name in the list of the abbots of a monastery in Switzerland, of a date which agrees with the age of Abélard's son.

his Heloisa to stand in his way? <sup>1</sup> These were the arguments of Heloisa herself: this is a heroism of self-abnegation incredible in any but a deeply-loving woman; and even in her so rare as to be matter of astonishment.

The fears or the remorse of Abélard were stronger than the reasonings of Heloisa. He endeavored to appease the injured uncle by a secret marriage, which took place at Paris. But the secret was soon divulged by the wounded pride and the vanity of Fulbert. Heloisa, still faithful to her lover's least wishes and interests, denied the marriage; and Abélard removed her to the nunnery of Argenteuil. There, in all but taking the veil and in receiving his stolen visits, which did not respect the sanctity of the place, her sweetness, her patience, her piety, her conformity to all the rules, won her the universal respect and esteem.

Fulbert still suspected, he might well suspect, that Abélard intended to compel his wife to take the veil, and so release him from the ties of wedlock. His revenge was that of the most exquisite and ingenious malice, as well as of the most inhuman cruelty. It aimed at blasting the ambition, as well as punishing the lust of its victim. By his mutilation (for <sup>Mutilation.</sup> in this respect the canon law strictly followed <sup>A.D. 1119.</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Her whole soul is expressed in the quotation from Lucan, uttered, it is said, when she entered the cloister at Argenteuil: —

“O maxime conjux!

O thalamis indigne meis. Hoc juris habebat  
In tantum fortuna caput? Cur impia nupsi;  
Si miserum factura fui? Nunc accipe pœnas,  
Sed quas sponte luam.”

Noble, but not nunlike lines!

that of Leviticus) Abélard might, he thought, be forever disqualified from ecclesiastical honors. The punishment of Abélard's barbarous enemies, of Fulbert and his accomplices, which was demanded by the public voice, and inflicted by the civil power, could not console; the general commiseration could only aggravate his misery and despair. He threw himself, at first determined to shun the sight of the world, into the monastery of St. Denys; Heloisa, still passive to his commands, took the veil at Argenteuil. But even to the end the fervent affections of Heloisa were hardly transferred to holier and more spiritual objects; religion, when it became a passion, might soften, it could not efface from her heart, that towards Abélard.

The fame of Abélard, and his pride and ungovernable soul, still pursued him; his talents retained their vigor; his temper was unsubdued. The monastery of St. Denys was dissolute. Abélard became a severe reformer; he rebuked the abbot and the whole community for their lax discipline, their unexemplary morals. He retired to a private cell, and near it opened a school. So great was the concourse of scholars, that lodging and provision could not be found for the countless throng. On the one side was an object of the most excessive admiration, on the other of the most implacable hatred. His enemies urged the bishop of the province to interdict his lectures, as tainted with secular learning unbecoming a monk. His disciples, with more dangerous adulation, demanded of the great teacher the satisfaction of their reason on the highest points of theology, which they could no longer receive in simple faith. They would no longer be blind leaders of the blind, nor pretend to believe what they did not

clearly comprehend.<sup>1</sup> Abélard composed a theological treatise, in which he discussed the awful mystery of the Trinity in Unity.

His enemies were on the watch. Two of his old discomfited antagonists at Laon, named Alberic Council of Soissons. A. D. 1121. and Litolf, denounced him before Rodolph Archbishop of Rheims, and Conon Bishop of Præneste, the Legate of the Pope. He was summoned to appear before a Council at Soissons. A rumor was spread abroad that he asserted that there were three Gods. He hardly escaped being stoned by the populace. But no one ventured to cope with the irresistible logician. Abélard offered his book; not a voice was raised to arraign it. The prudent and friendly Godfrey, Bishop of Chartres, demanded a fair hearing for Abélard; he was answered by a general cry that the whole world could not disentangle his sophisms. The council was drawing to a close. The enemies of Abélard persuaded the Archbishop and the Legate, who were unlettered men and weary of the whole debate, to command the book to be burned, and the author to be punished by seclusion in a monastery for his intolerable presumption in writing and lecturing on such subjects without the authority of the Pope and of the Church. This was a simple and summary proceeding. Abélard was compelled to throw his book into the fire with his own hands, and, weeping at the loss of his labors, to recite aloud the Athanasian creed. He was then sent, as to a prison, to the convent of St. Médard, but before long was permitted to return to his cell at St. Denys.

<sup>1</sup> "Nec credi posse aliquid, nisi primitus intellectum, et ridiculosum esse aliquem aliis prædicare, quod nec ipse, nec illi quos doceret, intellectu capere." — Abélard, Oper.



His imprudent passion for truth plunged him in a new calamity. He ventured to question, from a passage in Bede, whether the patron saint of the abbey St. Denys. was indeed the Dionysius of St. Paul, the famous Areopagite. The monks had hardly endured his remonstrances against their dissolute lives; when he questioned the authenticity of their saint, their fury knew no bounds. They declared that Bede was an incorrigible liar, Abélard a sacrilegious heretic. Their founder had travelled in Greece, and brought home irrefragable proofs that their St. Denys was the convert of St. Paul. It was not the honor of the monastery alone which was now at stake, but that of the whole realm. Abélard was denounced as guilty of treasonable impiety against France by thus deposing her great tutelar saint. The vengeance of the King was invoked against him. Abélard fled. Both he and the prior of a monastery near Troyes, who was so rash as to be one of his believers, were threatened with excommunication. The blow so shocked the Abbot of St. Denys (he was said indeed to have broken his constitution by intemperance) that he died, and thus relieved Abélard from one of his most obstinate and bitter enemies. The Court was appeased, and through the royal interest, Abélard was permitted to withdraw to a more peaceful solitude.

After some delay Abélard availed himself of the royal permission; he found a wild retreat, near the small river Ardrissan, not far from Troyes. There, like the hermits of old, he built his solitary cabin of osiers and of thatch. But the sanctity of Antony or of Benedict, or of the recent founder of the Cistercian order, was not more attractive than the cell of the phi-

losopher. Abélard, thus degraded in the eyes of men and in his own estimation by his immorality and by its punishment, branded with the suspicion of heresy by a council of the Church, with a reputation for arrogance and an intractable temper, which brought discord wherever he went, an outcast of society rather than a world-wearied anchorite, had nevertheless lost none of his influence. The desert was peopled around him by his admiring scholars; they left the castle and the city to dwell in the wilderness; for their lofty palaces they built lowly hovels; for their delicate viands they fed on bread and wild herbs; instead of soft beds they reposed contentedly on straw and chaff. Abélard proudly adapted to himself the words of Scripture, "Behold, the whole world is gone after him; by our persecution we have prevailed nothing, we have but increased his glory." A monastery arose, which had hardly space in its cells for the crowding votaries; <sup>A.D. 1122, 1125.</sup> Abélard called it by the name of the Paraclete — a name which, for its novelty and seeming presumption, gave new offence to his multiplying enemies.<sup>1</sup>

But it was not the personal hatred alone which Abélard had excited by his haughty tone and vituperative language, or even by his daring criticism of old legends. His whole system of teaching, the foundation, and discipline, and studies, in the Paraclete, could not but be looked upon with alarm and suspicion. This new philosophic community, a community at least bound together by no religious vow and governed by <sup>The Paraclete.</sup> no rigid monastic rules, in which the profoundest and most awful mysteries of religion were freely discussed, in which the exercises were those of the school

<sup>1</sup> Opp. Abélard, Epist. i. p. 28.

rather than of the cloister, and dialectic disputations rather than gloomy ascetic practices the occupation, awoke the vigilant jealousy of the two great reformers of the age, Norbert, the Archbishop of Magdeburg, whose great achievement had been the subjection of the regular canons to a severer rule, and Bernard, whose abbey of Clairvaux was the model of the most rigorous, most profoundly religious monastic life. The founder of the Paraclete was at least a formidable rival, if not a dangerous antagonist. Abélard afterwards scornfully designated these two adversaries as the new apostles; but they were the apostles of the ancient established faith, himself that of the new school, the heresy, not less fearful because undefinable, of free inquiry. Neither Norbert nor Bernard probably comprehended the full tendency of this premature intellectual movement, but they had an instinctive apprehension of its antagonism to their own power and influence, as well as to the whole religious system, which had now full possession of the human mind. There was as yet no declaration of war, no direct accusation, no summons to answer specific charges before council or legate; but that worse hostility of secret murmurs, of vague suspicions spread throughout Christendom, of solemn warnings, of suggested fears. Abélard, in all his pride, felt that he stood alone, an object of universal suspicion; he could not defend himself against this unseen, unaggressive warfare; he was as a man reported to be smitten with the plague, from whom the sound and healthy shrunk with an instinctive dread, and who had no power of forcing an examination of his case. His overweening haughtiness broke down into overweening dejection. He was so miserable that in his despair he

thought seriously of taking refuge beyond the borders of Christendom, of seeking elsewhere that quiet which was refused him by Christian hostility, to live as a Christian among the declared foes of Christianity.<sup>1</sup>

Whether from personal respect, or the national pride of the Bretons in their distinguished countryman, he was offered the dignity of Abbot in a monas-  
Abélard at  
St. Gildas in  
Brittany.  
A.D. 1125-6.  
 tery on the coast of Brittany in Morbihan, that  
 of St. Gildas de Rhuys. It was a bleak and  
 desolate region, the monks as rude and savage as the people, even the language was unknown to Abélard. There, on the very verge of the world, on the shores of the ocean, Abélard sought in vain for quiet. The monks were as lawless in life as in manners ; there was no common fund, yet Abélard was expected to maintain the buildings and religious services of the community. Each monk spent his private property on his wife or his concubine. Abélard, always in extremes, endeavored to submit this rugged brotherhood to the discipline of a Norbert or a Bernard ; but rigor in an abbot who knows not how to rouse religious enthusiasm is resented as tyranny. Among the wild monks of St. Gildas the life of Abélard was in constant peril. From their obtuse and ignorant minds his wonderful gifts and acquirements commanded no awe ; they were utterly ignorant of his learned language ; they hated his strictness and even his piety. Violence threatened him without the walls, treachery within. They tried to poison him ; they even drugged the cup of the Holy

<sup>1</sup> "Sæpe autem, Deus scit, in tantam lapsus sum desperationem, ut Christianorum finibus excessis, ad gentes transire disposerem, atque ibi quietè sub quacunque *tributi pactione* inter inimicos Christi Christianè vivere." Does not the *tribute* point to some Mohammedan country? Had Abélard heard of the learning of the Arabs? — Hist. Calamit.

Eucharist. A monk who had tasted food intended for him died in agony. The Abbot extorted oaths of obedience, he excommunicated, he tried to the utmost the authority of his office. He was obliged at length to take refuge in a cell remote from the monastery with a very few of the better monks; there he was watched by robbers hired to kill him.

The deserted Paraclete in the mean time had been reoccupied by far different guests. Heloisa had lived in blameless dignity as the prioress of Argenteuil. The rapacious monks of St. Denys, to whom Argenteuil belonged, expelled the nuns and resumed the property of the convent. The Paraclete, abandoned by Abélard's scholars, and falling into decay, offered to Heloisa an honorable retreat with her sisters: she took possession of the vacant cells. A correspondence began with the abbot of St. Gildas. Abélard's history of his calamities, that most naked and unscrupulous autobiography, reawakened the soft but melancholy reminiscences of the abbess of the Paraclete. Those famous letters were written, in which Heloisa dwells with such touching and passionate truth on her yet unextinguished affection. Age, sorrow, his great calamity, his persecutions, his exclusive intellectual studies, perhaps some real religious remorse, have frozen the springs of Abélard's love, if his passion may be dignified with that holy name. In him all is cold, selfish, almost coarse; in Heloisa the tenderness of the woman is chastened by the piety of the saint: much is still warm, almost passionate, but with a deep sadness in which womanly, amorous regret is strangely mingled with the strongest language of religion.

The monastery of St. Gildas seemed at length to



have been reduced to order ; but when peace surrounded Abélard, Abélard could not be at peace. He is again before the world, again in the world ; again committed, and now in fatal strife with his great and unforgiving adversary. His writings had now obtained popularity, as wide spread, and perilous, as his lectures and his disputations. Abélard, it might seem, in desperation provoked the contest with that adversary in his stronghold. He challenged Bernard before kings and prelates whom Bernard ruled with irresistible sway ; he entered the lists against authority where authority was supreme — in a great Council. At issue with the deep devotional spirit of the age, he chose his time when all minds were excited by the most solemn action of devotion — the Crusade : he appealed to reason when reason was least likely to be heard.

A Council had been summoned at Sens for a religious ceremony which more than all others June 2, 1140. roused the passions of local and national devotion — the translation of the body of the patron saint. The king, Louis VII., the Counts of Nevers and Champagne, a train of nobles, and all the prelates of the realm were to be present. Before this audience Abélard dared his adversary to make good his charges of heresy, by which it was notorious that Bernard and his monks had branded his writings. Bernard St. Bernard. himself must deliver his opinion of Abélard's writings in his own words : he is a witness as well to their extensive dissemination as to their character in the estimation of the clergy and of the monks. “ These books of Abélard are flying abroad all over the world ; they no longer shun the light ; they find their way into castles and cities ; they pass from land to land, from one

people to another. A new gospel is promulgated, a new faith is preached. Disputations are held on virtue and vice not according to Christian morality; on the Sacraments of the Church not according to the rule of faith; on the mystery of the Trinity not with simplicity and soberness. This huge Goliath, with his armor-bearer Arnold of Brescia, defies the armies of the Lord to battle!"<sup>1</sup> Yet so great was the estimation of Abélard's powers that Bernard at first shrunk from the contest. "How should an unpractised stripling like himself, unversed in logic, meet the giant who was practised in every kind of debate?" He consented at length to appear, not as the accuser, only as a witness against Abélard. But already he had endeavored to influence the court; he had written to the bishops of France about to assemble at Sens rebuking their remissness, by which this wood of heresies, this harvest of errors, had been allowed to grow up around the spouse of Christ. The words of Abélard cannot be cited to show his estimation of Bernard. Outwardly he had even shown respect to Bernard. On a visit of friendly courtesy to the neighboring abbess of the Paraclete a slight variation in the service had offended Bernard's rigid sense of ecclesiastical unity. Abélard, with temper but with firmness, defended the change.<sup>2</sup> But

<sup>1</sup> Epist. ad Innocent. Papam.

<sup>2</sup> The question was the clause in the Lord's Prayer, "our daily bread," or "our bread day by day." This letter commences in a tone almost of deference; but Abélard soon resumes his language of superiority. What he says on the greater degree of authority to be ascribed to St. Matthew's Gospel over that of St. Luke is totally at variance with the notion of plenary inspiration. He asserts from Augustine, Gregory the Great, and even Gregory VII., that usage must give way to reason; and retorts very curiously on the innovations introduced by Bernard himself into the ordinary services.

the quiet and bitter irony of his disciple, who described the contest, may be accepted as an unquestionable testimony to his way of speaking in his esoteric circle and among his intimate pupils, of the even now almost canonized saint. "Already has winged fame dispersed the odor of thy sanctity throughout the world, vaunted thy merits, declaimed on thy miracles. We boasted of the felicity of our present age, glorified by the light of so brilliant a star ; we thought that the world, doomed to perdition, continued to subsist only through your merits ; we knew that on your will depended the mercy of heaven, the temperature of the air, the fertility of the earth, the blessing of its fruits. . . . Thou hadst lived so long, thou hadst given life to the Church through so many holy institutions, that the very devils were thought to roar at thy behest ; and we, in our littleness, boasted of our blessedness under a patron of such power."<sup>1</sup> Bernard and his admirers might well hate the man whose scholars were thus taught to despise that popular superstition which beheld miracles in all his works.

With these antagonistic feelings, and this disparaging estimate each of the other, met the two great champions. In Bernard the Past and the <sup>Council of</sup> <sup>Sens.</sup> Present centred all their powers and influences, the whole strength of the sacerdotal, ceremonial, inflexibly dogmatic, imaginative religion of centuries — the profound and submissive faith, the monastic austerity, the cowering superstition ; he was the spiritual dictator of the age, above kings, prelates, even above the Pope, he was the model of holiness, the worker of perpetual wonders. Abélard cannot be accepted as a prophetic

<sup>1</sup> Berengarii Epist., in Abélard Oper., p. 303.

type of the Future. Free inquiry could only emancipate itself at a much later period by allying itself with a strong counter-religious passion ; it must oppose the strength of individual Christianity to the despotism of ecclesiastical religion. Abélard's religion (it were most unjust to question his religion) was but a colder form of the dominant faith ; he was a monk, though against his own temperament and tone of feeling. But Abélard was pure intellect, utterly unimagi-native, logical to the most naked precision, analytical to the minutest subtilty ; even his devotion had no warmth ; he ruled the mind, but touched no heart. At best therefore he was the wonder, Bernard the object of admiration, reverence, love, almost of adoration.

The second day of the Council (the first had been devoted to the solemn translation of the relics) was appointed for this grand theological tournament. Not only the king, the nobles, the prelates of France, but all Christendom watched in anxious solicitude the issue of the conflict. Yet even before a tribunal so favorable, so preoccupied by his own burning words, Bernard was awed into calmness and moderation. He demanded only that the most obnoxious passages should be read from Abélard's works. It was to his amazement, no less than that of the whole council, when Abélard, instead of putting forth his whole strength in a reply, answered only, "I appeal to Rome," and left the hall of Council. It is said, to explain this unexpected abandonment of the field by the bold challenger, that he was in danger of his life. At Sens, as before at Soissons, the populace were so exasperated at the daring heretic, who was reported to have impeached the doctrine of the Trinity, that they were ready to

rise against him.<sup>1</sup> Bernard himself would hardly have interfered to save him from that summary refutation; <sup>2</sup> and Abélard, in the confidence of his own power and fame as a disputant, might perhaps expect Bernard to decline his challenge. He may have almost forgotten the fatal issue of the Council of Soissons; at a distance, in his retreat in Brittany, such a tribunal might appear less awful than when he saw it in undisguised and unappeased hostility before him. The Council may have been disappointed at this sudden close of the spectacle which they were assembled to behold; but they were relieved from the necessity of judging between the conflicting parties. Bernard, in the heat and pride of his triumph, after having in vain, and with taunts, provoked his mute adversary, proceeded now in no measured language to pursue his victory. The martial and unlearned prelates vainly hoped that as they had lost the excitement of the fray, they might escape the trouble and fatigue of this profound theological investigation. But the inflexible Bernard would as little spare them as he would his adversary. The faithful disciple of Abélard describes with some touches of satire, but with reality which reads like truth, the close of this memorable day. The discomfited Abélard had withdrawn; his books were now produced, a person commanded to read aloud all the objectionable parts at full length in all their logical aridity. The bishops, as evening drew on, grew weary, and relieved their fatigue with wine. The wine and the weariness brought

<sup>1</sup> "Dum de suâ fide discuteretur, seditionem populi timens, apostolicæ sedis præsentiam appellavit." — Otho Freisingen, i. 46.

<sup>2</sup> "An non justius os loquens talia fustibus conderetur, quam rationibus repelleretur." — So writes Bernard, Epist. p. 1554.



on sleep: the drowsy assembly sat, some leaning on their elbows, some with cushions under their heads, some with their heads dropping on their knees. At each pause they murmured sleepily "damnamus," we condemn, till at length some cut short the word and faintly breathed "namus."<sup>1</sup>

Abélard had appealed to Rome; at Rome his adversaries had prepared for his reception.

The report of the Council to Rome is in such terms as these: "Peter Abélard makes void the whole Christian faith by attempting to comprehend the nature of God through human reason. He ascends up into heaven, he goes down into hell. Nothing can elude him either in the height above or in the nethermost depths. A man great in his own eyes, disputing about faith against the faith, walking among the great and wonderful things which are above him, the searcher of the Divine Majesty, the fabricator of heresy. Already has his book on the Trinity been burned by order of one Council; it has now risen from the dead. Accursed is he that builds again the walls of Jericho. His branches spread over the whole earth; he boasts that he has disciples in Rome itself, even in the College of Cardinals; he draws the whole world after him; it is time therefore to silence him by apostolic authority."

An appeal from Bernard to Rome was an appeal from Bernard to himself. Pope Innocent II. was too completely under his influence, too deeply indebted to him, not to confirm at once his sentence. Bernard had already filled the ears of the Pope with the heresies of Abélard. He urged, he almost commanded, the Pope to proceed to instant judgment. "Shall he venture to

<sup>1</sup> Epist. Berengar. apud Abélard Oper.

appeal to the throne of Peter who denies the faith of Peter? For what has God raised thee up, lowly as thou wert in thine own eyes, and placed thee above kings and nations? Not that thou shouldest destroy but that thou shouldest build up the faith. God <sup>Bernard's triumph.</sup> has stirred up the fury of the schismatics that thou mightest have the glory of crushing it. This only was wanting to make thee equal to the most famous of thy predecessors, the condemnation of a heresy." <sup>1</sup> Bernard addressed another long controversial epistle to Innocent, and through him to all Christendom; it was the full view of Abélard's theology as it appeared to most of his own generation. He inveighs against Abélard's dialectic theory of the Trinity, his definition of faith as opinion; his wrath is kindled to its most fiery language by the tenet which he ascribes to Abélard, that the Son of God had not delivered man by his death from the yoke of the devil; that Satan had only the permitted and temporary power of a jailer, not full sovereignty over mankind: in other words, that man had still free-will; that Christ was incarnate rather to enlighten mankind by his wisdom and example, and died not so much to redeem them from slavery to the devil, as to show his own boundless love.<sup>2</sup> "Which is most intolerable, the blasphemy or the arrogance of his language? Which is most damnable, the temerity or the impiety? Would it not be more just to stop his mouth with blows than confute him by argument? Does not he whose hand is against

<sup>1</sup> Apud Labbe, et Mansi, et in Oper. S. Bernardi.

<sup>2</sup> "Ut dicat totum esse quod Deus in carne apparuit, nostram de vitâ et exemplo ipsius institutionem, sive ut postmodum dixit, instructionem: totum quod passus et mortuus est suæ erga nos charitatis ostensionem vel commendationem." — Epist. xcii. 1539.

every one, provoke the hand of every one against himself? All, he says, think thus, but I think otherwise! Who, then, art thou? What canst thou advance which is wiser, what hast thou discovered which is more subtile? What secret revelation canst thou boast which has escaped the saints and eluded the angels? . . . . Tell us what is this that thou alone canst see, that no one before thee hath seen? That the Son of God put on manhood for some purpose besides the deliverance of man from bondage. Assuredly this has been discovered by no one but by thee, and where hast thou discovered it? Thou hast received it neither from sage, nor prophet, nor apostle, nor from God himself. The apostle of the Gentiles received from God himself what he delivered to us. The apostle of the Gentiles declares that his doctrine comes from on high — ‘I speak not of myself.’ But thou deliverest what is thine own, what thou hast not received. He who speaks of himself is a liar. Keep to thyself what comes from thyself. For me, I follow the prophets and the apostles. I obey the Gospel, but not the Gospel according to *Peter*. Thou makest thyself a fifth evangelist. What says the law, what say the prophets, what say the apostles, what say their successors, that which thou alone deniest, that God was made man to deliver man from bondage? What, then, if an angel should come from heaven to teach us the contrary, accursed be the error of that angel!”

Absent, unheard, unconvicted, Abélard was condemned by the Supreme Pontiff. The condemnation was uttered almost before the charge could be fully known. The decree of Innocent reprov'd all public disputations on the myste-

Condemna-  
tion of  
Abélard at  
Rome.

ries of religion. Abélard was condemned to silence ; his disciples to excommunication.<sup>1</sup>

Abélard had set out on his journey to Rome ; he was stopped by severe illness, and found hospitable reception in the Abbey of Clugny. Abélard at Clugny.

Peter the Venerable, the Abbot of that famous monastery, did more than protect the outcast to the close of his life. He had himself gone through the ordeal of a controversy with the fervent Bernard, though their controversy had been conducted in a milder and more Christian spirit. Yet the Abbot of the more luxurious or more polished Clugny might not be sorry to show a gentleness and compassion uncongenial to the more austere Clairvaux. He even wrought an outward reconciliation between the persecuted Abélard and the victorious Bernard. It was but an outward, a hollow reconciliation. Abélard published an apology, if apology it might be called, which accused his adversary of ignorance or of malice. The apology not merely repelled the charge of Arianism, Nestorianism, but even the slightest suspicion of such doctrines ; and to allay the tender anxiety of Heloisa, who still took a deep interest in his fame and happiness, he sent her his creed, which might have satisfied the most austere orthodoxy. Even in the highest quarters, among the most distinguished prelates, there was at least strong compassion for Abélard, admiration for his abilities, perhaps secret indignation at the hard usage he had endured. Bernard knew that no less a person than Guido di Castello, afterwards Pope Cœlestine II., a disciple of Abélard, spoke of him at least with affection. To him Bernard writes, " He would not suppose that

<sup>1</sup> Apud Bernard, Epist. cxciv.

though Guido loved the man he could love his errors." <sup>1</sup> He suggests the peril of the contagion of such doctrines, and skilfully associates the name of Abélard with the most odious heresies. When he writes of the Trinity he has a savor of Arius; when of grace, of Pelagius; when of the person of Christ, of Nestorius. To the Cardinal Ivo he uses still stronger words — "Though a Baptist without in his austerities, he is a Herod within." Still for the last two years of his life Abélard found peace, honor, seclusion, in the Abbey April, 21, 1142. of Clugny. He died at the age of sixty-  
Death of three: <sup>2</sup> Peter the Venerable communicated  
Abélard. the tidings of his death to the still faithful Heloisa. His language may be contrasted with that of St. Bernard. "I never saw his equal for humility of manners and habits. St. Germanus was not more modest; nor St. Martin more poor. He allowed no moment to escape unoccupied by prayer, reading, writing, or dictation. The heavenly visitor surprised him in the midst of these holy works." <sup>3</sup> The remains of Abélard were transported to the Paraclete; an absolution obtained by Peter was deposited in his tomb; for twenty-one years the Abbess of the Paraclete mourned over her teacher, her lover, her husband; and then reposed by his side.

The intellectual movement of Abélard, as far as any acknowledged and hereditary school, died with Abélard. Even his great principle, that which he asserted rather

<sup>1</sup> Epist. cxii.

<sup>2</sup> Peter writes to Pope Innocent in the name of Abélard: "Ut reliquos dies vitæ et senectutis suæ, qui fortasse non multi sunt, in Cluniacâ vestrâ eum consummare jubeatis, et ne a domo quam velut passer, ne a nido quem velut turtur se invenisse gaudet, aliquorum instantiâ aut expelli aut commoveri valeat." — Petri Venerab. Epist. ad Innocent.

<sup>3</sup> Petri Vener. Epist. ad Heloisam.



than consistently maintained — the supremacy of reason — that principle which Bernard and the high devotional Churchmen looked on with vague but natural apprehension as eventually fatal to authority, fell into abeyance. The schoolmen connected together, as it were, reason and authority. The influence remained, but neutralized. The Book of Sentences of Peter Lombard is but the “*Sic et Non*” of Abélard in a more cautious and reverential form. John of Salisbury, in his *Polycraticus*, is a manifest, if not avowed Conceptualist. The sagacious and prophetic jealousy of his adversaries seems to have had a more clear though instinctive perception of the remoter consequences of his doctrines than Abélard himself. Abélard the philosopher seems, notwithstanding his arrogance, to be perpetually sharing these apprehensions. He is at once the boldest and most timid of men; always striking out into the path of free inquiry, but never following it onward; he plunges back, as if afraid of himself, into blind and submissive orthodoxy. The remorse for his moral aberrations, shame and fear of the world, seem weighing upon his mind, and repressing its free energy. He is no longer the arrogant, overbearing despot of the school; church authority is compelling him to ungracious submission. In his Lectures, even in his later days, it is probable that he was bolder and less inconsequent; many of the sayings on which the heaviest charges of his adversaries rested, whether withdrawn or never there, are not to be found in his works: he disclaims altogether the Book of Sentences, which may have been the note-book of his opinions by some of his scholars. He limits the notion of inspiration to a kind of moral or religious influence; it belongs to those who

are possessed with faith, hope, and charity. He is still more restrictive on the authority of the Fathers, and openly asserts their contradictions and errors. In his idolatry of the ancient philosophers, he compares their lives with those of the clergy of his day, to the disadvantage of the latter; places them far above the Jews, and those who lived under the Jewish dispensation; and gives them a dim, indeed, yet influential and saving knowledge of the Redeemer. When Bernard, therefore, confined himself to general charges, he might stand on strong ground; when he denounced the theology of Abélard as respecting no mystery, as rashly tearing away rather than gently lifting the veil from the holiest things, of rushing into the sanctuary, and openly disdaining to believe what it could not make perview to the understanding.<sup>1</sup> But when he began to define his charges, he was betrayed into exaggeration and injustice. No two great minds were probably less capable of comprehending each other. Some of the gravest charges rest on works which Abélard never wrote, some on obvious misconceptions, some on illustrations assumed to be positions; all perverted into close assimilation or identification with the condemned and hated ancient heresies.

The mature and peculiar philosophy of Abélard, but for its love for barren logical forms, and this dreaded worship of reason, his Conceptualism, might in itself not merely have been reconciled with the severest orthodoxy, but might have opened a safe intermediate ground between the Nominalism of Roscelin and the Realism of Anselm and William of Champeaux. As the former tended to a sensuous rationalism, so the lat-

<sup>1</sup> Epist. ad Episcop. 137, 138.

ter to a mystic pantheism. If everything but the individual was a mere name, then knowledge shrunk into that which was furnished by the senses alone. When Nominalism became Theology, the three persons of the Trinity (this was the perpetual touchstone of all systems), if they were more than words, were individuals, and Tritheism inevitable. On the other hand, God, the great Reality, absorbed into himself all other Realities; they became part of God; they became God. This was the more immediate danger; the deepest devotion became Mysticism, and resolved everything into God. Mysticism in Europe, as in India, melted into Pantheism. The Conceptualism of Abélard, allowing real existence to universals, but making those universals only cognizable as mental conceptions to the individual, might be in danger of falling into Sabellianism. The three persons would be but three manifestations of the Deity; a distinction only perceptible to the mind might seem to be made to the mind alone. Yet, on the other hand, as the perception of a spiritual Deity can only be through the mind or the spirit, the mystery might seem more profound according to this view, which, while it repudiated the materializing tendencies of the former system, by its more clear and logical Idealism kept up the strong distinction between God and created things, between the human and divine mind, the all-pervading soul — and the soul of man.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The real place which Abélard's Conceptualism (if, as I think, it has its place) holds between the crude Nominalism of Roscelin, and the mysticism, if not mystic Realism, of William of Champeaux, belongs to the history of philosophy rather than of Christianity. M. Cousin denies to Abélard any intermediate ground. On the other hand, a writer, who in my judgment sometimes writes rather loosely, at others with much sagacity, M. Xavier Rousselot, finds a separate and independent position in philosophy and in

There is one treatise, indeed, the famous "*Sic et Non*," which has been recovered in the present day, and if of itself taken as the exposition of Abélard's philosophical theology, might, though written under the semblance of profound reverence for antiquity, even from its form and title, have startled an age less devotional, less under the bondage of authority. In this treatise Abélard propounds all the great problems of religion, with the opinions, the conflicting opinions, of the Fathers; at times he may seem disposed to establish a friendly harmony, at others they are committed in irreconcilable strife. It is a history of the antagonism and inward discord, of the disunity of the Church. Descartes himself did not establish the principle of doubt as the only source of true knowledge more coldly and nakedly, or more offensively to his own age from its cautious justification in the words of him who is all truth.<sup>1</sup> If Bernard knew this treatise, it explains at once all Bernard's implacable hostility; to himself, no doubt, the suppression of such principles would justify any means of coercion, almost any departure from ordinary rules of fairness and justice. It is nothing that to the calmer judgment the

theology for the system of Abélard. Abélard certainly must have deceived himself if he was no more than a concealed Nominalist. See the summary of Abélard's opinions in Haureau, *de la Philosophie Scolastique*. M. Haureau defines Abélard's Conceptualism as a "*Nominalisme raisonnable*. La philosophie d'Abélard est la philosophie de la prudence, la philosophie du sens commun." If I may presume to say so, Abélard was less led to this intermediate position by his own prudence, than by his keen sagacity in tracing the consequences of Nominalism and extreme Realism. See also C. de Rémusat, Abélard.

<sup>1</sup> "*Dubitare enim de singulis non erit inutile. Dubitando enim ad inquisitionem venimus; inquirendo veritatem percipimus, juxta quos et Veritas ipsa 'quærite et invenietis, pulsate et aperietur vobis.'*" — Prolog. ad *Sic et Non*.

"Sic et Non" by no means fulfils its own promise, that it is far more harmless to the devout than it threatens to be; far less satisfactory to the curious and speculative: it must be taken in its spirit, to estimate the rude shock which it must have given to the yet unawakened, or but half-awakened mind of Christendom: so only can a judgment be formed on the real controversy between the Founder of the Paraclete and the Abbot of Clairvaux.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> M. Cousin has only printed parts of the Sic et Non. But he has given the heads of the chapters omitted, many of which more provoke the curiosity than those which he has chosen. The whole Sic et Non has now been printed at Marburg from another manuscript (at Munich), by Henke and Lindenkohl, Marburg, 1851. Father Tosti, a monk of Monte Casino, author of a life or apology for Boniface VIII. (hereafter to be quoted), has published a life of Abélard, written with more candor than might be expected from such a quarter. He was urged to this work by finding in the archives of Monte Casino MSS. containing unpublished fragments of Abélard's *Theologia Christiana*, and of the Sic et Non, of which he had only seen concise extracts.

In fact, the Sic et Non is nothing but a sort of manual for scholastic disputation, of which it was the rule that each combatant must fight, right or wrong. It was an armory from which disputants would find weapons to their hands on any disputable point; and all points by the rule of this warfare were disputable.



## CHAPTER VI.

## ARNOLD OF BRESCIA.

BERNARD had triumphed over the intellectual insurrection against the authority of the Church ; but there was a rebellion infinitely more dangerous, at least in its immediate consequences, brooding in the minds of men : the more formidable because more popular, the more imminent because it appealed at once to the passions and the plain vulgar sense of man. To judge from the number of his disciples, Abélard's was a popular movement ; that of Arnold was absolutely, avowedly democratic ; it raised a new class of men, and to them transferred at once power, authority, wealth. There was an ostensible connection between these two outbursts of freedom, which at first sight might appear independent of, almost incongruous with, each other, except in their common hostility to the hierarchical system. Arnold of Brescia was a hearer of Abélard, a pupil in his revolutionary theology or revolutionary philosophy, and aspired himself to a complete revolution in civil affairs : he was called, as has been seen, the armor-bearer of the giant Abélard. The two were even more nearly allied in their kindred origin. Monasticism was the common parent of both. The theory of monasticism, which was acknowledged even by most of the clergy themselves to be the absolute perfection of Chris-

tianity, its true philosophy, was in perpetual and glaring contradiction with the actual visible state of the clergy and of the older and wealthier monasteries. This theory was the total renunciation of the world, of property, even of volition; it was the extreme of indigence, the scantiest fare, the coarsest dress, the lowliest demeanor, the hardest toil, both in the pursuits of industry and in the offices of religion; the short and interrupted sleep, the incessant devotional exercise, usually the most severe self-inflicted pain. The poorer, the more mortified, the more secluded, the more absolutely cut off from all indulgence, the nearer to sanctity. Nor was this a remote, obsolete, traditionary theory. Every new aspirant after monastic perfection, every founder of an order, and of every recent monastery, exemplified, or he would never have founded an order or built a monastery, this poor, self-abasing, self-excruciating holiness. Stephen Harding, Bernard and his followers, and all who lived up to their principles in their own persons, to those around them and by their wide-spread fame, stood before the world not merely as beacon-lights of true Christianity, but as uttering a perpetual protest, a rebuke against the lordly, rich, and luxurious prelates and abbots. Their vital principles, their principles of action, were condemnatory of ecclesiastical riches. "It is just," writes St. Bernard, "that he who serves the altar should live of the altar; but it is not to live of the altar to indulge luxury and pride at the expense of the altar: this is robbery, this is sacrilege."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Concedatur ergo tibi ut si bene deservis de altario vivas, non autem ut de altario luxurieris, ut de altario superbias, ut inde compares tibi frena aurea, sellas depictas, calcearia deargentata, varia grisiaque pellicia a collo

The subtle, by no means obvious, distinction, that the wealth of the Church was the wealth of God ;<sup>1</sup> that the patrimony of the Papacy was not in the Pope, but in St. Peter, and of every other church in its patron saint ; that not merely the churches, but the conventual edifices, with all their offices, stables, granaries, and gardens (wanting, perhaps, to the noblest castle), were solely for the glory of God, not for the use and pride of man ; that the clergy on their palfreys with golden bits, and embroidered housings, and silver spurs, and furred mantles of scarlet or purple, were not men, but ministers of God ; this convenient merging of the individual in the official character, while the individual enjoyed personally all the admiration, envy, respect, comfort, luxury, influence of his station, might satisfy the conscience of those whose conscience desired to be satisfied, but was altogether unintelligible to the common sense of mankind. The more devout abbots and prelates, some doubtless of the Popes, might wear the haircloth under the robe of purple and of fur ; they might sit at the gorgeous banquet tasting only the dry bread or simple vegetable ; after the pomp and ceremony of some great day of temporal or ecclesiastical business, might pass the night on the rough board or the cold stone, or on their knees in the silent church, unobserved by men : the outward show of pride or luxury might be secretly repressed or chastened by the most austere fast, by the bloody penitential scourge. But mankind judges, if unjustly towards individuals, justly

et manibus ornatu purpureo diversifac̃ta. Denique quicquid præter necessarium victum ac simplicem vestitum de altario retineas tuum non est, impium est, sacrilegum est." — Bernard, Epist. ad Fulcon.

<sup>1</sup> "Saltem quæ Dei sunt *ipsius* violenter auferre nolite." — Epist. Nicol. I. ad Aquitan. apud Bouquet, p. 416.

perhaps of systems and institutions, from the outward and manifest effects. A clergy with an ostentatious display of luxury and wealth was to them a wealthy and luxurious clergy — a clergy which was always grasping after power, an ambitious clergy. Who could question, who refuse to see the broad irresistible fact of this discrepancy between the monastic theory, constantly preached and lauded in their ears, to which they were to pay, to which they were not disinclined to pay, respect bordering on adoration, and the ordinary actual Christianity of the great ecclesiastical body? If poverty was apostolic, if poverty was of Christ himself, if the only real living likenesses of the Apostles and of Christ were the fasting, toiling, barely-clad, self-scourging monks, with their cheeks sunk by famine, their eyes on the ground, how far from the Apostles, how far from Christ, were those princely bishops, those abbots, holding their courts like sovereigns! The cowering awe of the clergy, the influence of the envied wealth and state itself, might repress, but it would not subdue, if once awakened, the sense of this discrepancy. But once boldly stirred by a popular teacher, by a man of vehement eloquence, unsuspected sincerity, restless activity, unimpeachable religious orthodoxy, how fearful to the hierarchy, to the whole sacerdotal system! — and such a man was Arnold of Brescia.<sup>1</sup>

Arnold was a native of the Lombard city of Brescia. Of his youth and education nothing Arnold a disciple of Abélard. is known. His adolescence ripened amid the advancing political republicanism of the Lombard cities.

<sup>1</sup> The birth of Arnold is vaguely assigned to the beginning of the twelfth century. Guadagnani conjectures with some probability that he was born about 1105. There is a life of Arnold by H. Francke, "Arnold von Brescia," Zurich, 1825.

With the inquisitive and aspiring youth from all parts of Europe, he travelled to France, to attend the great instructor of the times, Peter Abélard, probably at that period when Abélard was first settled in the wilderness of the Paraclete, and when his high-born and wealthy scholars submitted to such severe privations in pursuit of knowledge, and became monks in all but religious submissiveness. Arnold throughout his life passed as a disciple, as a faithful follower of Abélard. But while others wrought out the daring speculative views of Abélard, delighted in his logical subtilties, and with him endeavored to tear away the veil which hung over the sacred mysteries of the faith, Arnold seized on the practical, the political, the social consequences. On all the high mysterious doctrines of the Church, the orthodoxy of Arnold was unimpeachable; his personal life was that of the sternest monk; he had the most earnest sympathy with the popular religion. On the Sacraments alone his opinions were questioned; and as to them, rather on account of their connection with the great object of his hostility, the sacerdotal power. The old edifice of the hierarchy, which had been rising for centuries till it governed the world, possessed in all the kingdoms a very large proportion of the land; had assumed the judicial, in some cases the military functions of the state; had raised the Pope to a sovereign prince, who, besides his own dominions, held foreign kingdoms in feudal subordination to himself: all this Arnold aspired to sweep away from the face of the earth. He would reduce the clergy to their primitive and apostolic poverty;<sup>1</sup> confiscate all their

<sup>1</sup> "Primitias et quæ devotio plebis  
Offerat, et decimas castos in corporis usus,



wealth, escheat all their temporal power. Their estates he secularized at once; he would make them ministers of religion and no more, modestly maintained by the first fruits and tithes of the people. And that only as a holy clergy, on a voluntary system, but in every respect subject to the supreme civil power. On that power, too, Arnold would boldly lay his reforming hand. His Utopia was a great Christian republic, exactly the reverse of that of Gregory VII. As religious and as ambitious as Hildebrand, Arnold employed the terrors of the other world, with as little scruple to depose, as the pontiff to exalt the authority of the clergy. Salvation was impossible to a priest holding property, a bishop exercising temporal power, a monk retaining any possession whatever. This he grounded not on the questionable authority of the Church, but on the plain Gospel of Christ: to that Gospel he appealed with intrepid confidence. It was the whole feudal system, imperial as well as pontifical, which was to vanish away: the temporal sovereign was to be the fountain of honor, of wealth, of power. To the sovereign were to revert all the possessions of the Church, the estates of the monasteries, the royalties of the Pope and the bishops.<sup>1</sup> But that sovereign was a popular assembly. Like other fond republicans, Arnold hoped to find in a

Non ad luxuriam, neve oblectamina carnis  
 Concedens, mollesque cibos, cultusque nitorem,  
 Illicitosque jocos, lascivaque gaudia cleri,  
 Pontificum fastus, abbatum denique laxos  
 Damnabat penitus mores, monachosque superbos."

*Gunther*, iii. 273, &c.

<sup>1</sup> "Dicebat nec clericos proprietatem, nec episcopos regalia, nec monachos possessiones habentes aliquâ ratione salvari posse. Cuncta hæc principis esse, ab ejusque beneficentiâ in usum tantum laicorum cedere oportere." — Otho Freisingen.

democratic senate, chosen out of, and chosen by, the unchristian as well as the Christian part of the community, that Christianity for which he looked in vain in the regal and pontifical autocracies, in the episcopal and feudal oligarchies of the time.<sup>1</sup> This, which the most sanguine in the nineteenth century look upon as visionary, or, after a long discipline of religious and social education, but remotely possible, Arnold hoped to raise as if by enchantment, among the rude, ignorant, oppressed lower classes of the twelfth. So the alliance of the imperial and pontifical power, which in the end was so fatal to Arnold, was grounded on no idle fear or wanton tyranny, it was an alliance to crush a common enemy.

The Church of Rome has indeed boasted her natural sympathy and willing league with freedom. Her confederacy with the young republics of Lombardy is considered the undeniable manifestation of this spirit. But there at least her love of freedom was rather hatred of the imperial power; it was a struggle at their cost for her own aggrandizement. In Brescia, as in many other cities in the north of Italy, the Bishop Arimanno had taken the lead in shaking off all subjection to the Empire. Brescia declared herself a republic, and established a municipal government; but the bishop usurped the sovereignty wrested from the Empire. He assumed the state, the power of a feudal lord; the estates of the Church were granted as fiefs, on the condition of military service to defend his authority. Brescia complained

<sup>1</sup> "Omnia principiis terrenis subdita, tantum  
Committenda viris popularibus atque regenda."

*Gunther*, iii. 277.

Compare the whole passage.

with justice that the Church and the poor were robbed to maintain the secular pomp of the baron. The republican spirit, kindled by the bishop, would not endure his tyranny. He was worsted in a bloody and desolating war; he was banished for three years to the distance of fifty miles from the city. Arimanno, the bishop, was deposed by Pope Paschal in the Lateran Council at Rome, A.D. 1116; his coadjutor Conrad promoted to the see. Conrad sought to raise again the fallen power of the bishopric, and Conrad in his turn was dispossessed by his coadjutor Manfred. Innocent II. appeared in Brescia. There is little doubt that Conrad had embraced the faction of the Antipope <sup>July 26-29,</sup> Anacletus, Manfred therefore was confirmed <sup>1132.</sup> in the see. The new bishop attempted, in a synod at Brescia, to repress the concubinage and likewise the vices of the clergy; but in the assertion of his temporal power he was no less ambitious and overbearing than his predecessors. To execute his decree he entered into a league with the consuls of the city. But the married clergy and their adherents were too strong for the bishop and the adherents of the rigorists. The consuls and the bishop were expelled from the city. Manfred was afterwards replaced by the legate of the Pope, and now appears to have thrown himself into the party of the nobles.

It was in this state of affairs that the severe and blameless Arnold began to preach his captivating but alarming doctrines. Prelates like Manfred and his predecessors were not likely to awe those who esteemed apostolic poverty and apostolic lowliness the only true perfection of the Christian. Secular pomp and luxury were almost inseparable from secular power. The

clergy of a secular bishop would hardly be otherwise than secular. Arnold, on his return to Brescia, had received the two lower orders of the Church as a reader; he then took the religious vow and became a monk: a monk of primitive austerity.<sup>1</sup> He was a man of stern republican virtue, and of stern republican sentiments; his enemies do justice to his rigid and blameless character. The monk in truth and the republican had met in him, the admirer of the old Roman liberty and of the lowly religion of Christ. He was seemingly orthodox in all his higher creed, though doubts were intimated of his soundness on image-worship, on relics, on infant baptism, and the Eucharist — those strong foundations of the sacerdotal power.<sup>2</sup> From his austerity, and the silence of his adversaries as to such obnoxious opinions, it is probable that he was severe on the question of the marriage of the clergy; he appears standing alone, disconnected with that faction. His eloquence was singularly sweet, copious, and flowing, but at the same time vigorous and awakening, sharp as a sword and soft as oil.<sup>3</sup> He called upon the people to compel the clergy, and especially the bishop, to retire altogether into their proper functions; to abandon all temporal power, all property. The populace listened to his doctrines with fanatic ardor; he preached in the

<sup>1</sup> "Arnoldum loquor de Brixia qui utinam tam sanæ esset doctrinæ quam districtæ est vitæ; et si vultis scire, homo est neque manducans neque bibens, solo cum diabolo esuriens et sitiens sanguinem animarum." — Bernard, Epist. 195.

<sup>2</sup> "Præter hæc de sacramento altaris et baptismo parvulorum non sanè dicitur sensisse." — Otho Freisingen. Did he attach the validity of the rite to the holiness of the priest?

<sup>3</sup> "Lingua ejus gladius acutus — molliti sunt sermones ejus sicut oleum, et ipsa sunt jacula — allicit blandis sermonibus." — Bernard, Epist. 195; see also 196. "Pulcrum fallendi noverat artem . . . mellifluis admiscens toxica verbis." — Gunther.

pulpits and the market-places, incessantly, boldly, and fearless whom he might assail, the Pope himself, or the lowliest priest, in the deep inward conviction of the truth of his own doctrines. He unfolded the dark pages of ecclesiastical history to a willing auditory.<sup>1</sup> The whole city was in the highest state of excitement ; and not Brescia alone, the doctrines spread like wildfire through Lombardy ; many other cities were moved if not to tumult, to wild expectation.<sup>2</sup> Some of the nobles as laymen had been attracted by the doctrines of Arnold ; but most of them made common cause with the bishop, who was already of their faction. The bishopric was a great benefice, which each might hope to fill with some one of his own family. The bishop therefore, the whole clergy, the wealthier monasteries, the higher nobles, were bound together by their common fears, by their common danger. Yet even then a popular revolution was averted only by an appeal to Rome—to Rome where Innocent, his rival overthrown, was presiding in the great Council of the Lateran ; Innocent replaced on his throne by all the great monarchs of Christendom, and environed by a greater number of prelates than had ever assembled in any Council.

Before that supreme tribunal Arnold was accused,

1 Even Gunther is betrayed into some praise.

“Veraque multa quidem nisi tempora nostra fideles  
Respuerant monitus, falsis admixta monebat.”

“Dum Brixiensem ecclesiam perturbaret, laicisque terræ illius, prurientes erga clerum aures habentibus, ecclesiasticas malitiose exponeret paginas.”  
— Otho Freisingen, ii. 20.

2 “Ille suum vecors in clerum pontificemque,  
. . . atque alias plures commoverat urbes.”

*Gunther.*



not it should seem of heresy, but of the worst kind of schism;<sup>1</sup> his accusers were the bishop and all the higher clergy of Brescia. Rome, it is said, shuddered, as she might with prophetic dread, at the doctrine and its author; yet the Council was content with imposing silence on Arnold, and banishment from Italy. With this decree the bishops and the clergy returned to Brescia; the fickle people were too much under the terror of their religion to defend their teacher.<sup>2</sup> The nobles seized the opportunity of expelling the two popular consuls, who were branded as hypocrites and heretics. Arnold fled beyond the Alps, and took refuge in Zurich. It is singular to observe this more than Protestant, sowing as it were the seeds of that total abrogation of the whole hierarchical system, completed in Zurich by Zuingle, the most extreme of the reformers in the age of Luther.

Beyond the Alps Arnold is again the scholar, the faithful and devoted scholar of Abélard. Neither their admirers nor their enemies seem to discern the vital difference between the two; they are identified by their common hostility to the authority of the Church. Abélard addressed the abstract reason, Arnold the popular passions; Abélard undermined the great dogmatic system, Arnold boldly assailed the vast temporal power of the Church; Abélard treated the hierarchy with respect, but brought into question the doctrines of the Church; Arnold, with deep reverence for the doctrines,

<sup>1</sup> "Accusatus est apud dominum Papam *schismate pessime*." — St. Bernard. There is no evidence that he was involved in the condemnation of Peter of Bruelys and the Cathari in the 23d canon.

<sup>2</sup> Malvezzi apud Muratori, vol. xiv.

shook sacerdotal Christianity to its base ; Abélard was a philosopher, Arnold a demagogue. Bernard was watching both with the persevering sagacity of jealousy, and of fear for his own imperilled faith, his imperilled Church. His fiery zeal was not content with the condemnation of Abélard by the Council of Sens,<sup>1</sup> and the Pope's rescript condemnatory of Arnold in the Lateran Council. He urged the Pope to take further measures for their condemnation, for the burning of their books, and secure custody of their persons. The obsequious Pope, in a brief but violent letter addressed to the Archbishops of Rheims and Sens and to the Abbot of Clairvaux, commanded that the books containing such damnable doctrines should be publicly cast into the fire, the two heresiarchs separately imprisoned in some religious house. The papal letter was disseminated throughout France by the restless activity of Bernard,<sup>2</sup> but men were weary or ashamed of the persecution ; he was heard with indifference. Abélard, as has been seen, found a retreat in the abbey of Clugny ; what was more extraordinary, Arnold found a Arnold with Guido di Castello. protector in a papal legate, in a future Pope, the Cardinal Guido di Castello. Like Arnold, Guido had been a scholar of Abélard, he had betrayed so much sympathy with his master as to receive the rebuke,

<sup>1</sup> It is not clear at what time or in what manner Arnold undertook the defence of Abélard's dangerous propositions. Abélard and his disciples had maintained silence before the Council of Sens ; and there Arnold was not present.

<sup>2</sup> See Nicolini's preface to his tragedy of Arnold of Brescia : — " Ut Petrum Abeilardum et Arnoldum de Brixia, perversi dogmatis fabricatores et catholicæ fidei impugnatores, in religiosis locis, ut iis melius fuerint, separatim faciant includi, et libros eorum, ubicunque reperti fuerint, igne comburi." — 1140, July 16. Mansi, xxi. St. Bernard Oper., Appendix, p. 76.

above alluded to, from Bernard, softened only by the dignity of his position and character. His protection of Arnold was more open and therefore more offensive to the Abbot of Clairvaux. He wrote in a mingled tone of earnest admonition and angry expostulation. "Arnold of Brescia, whose words are as honey but whose doctrines are poison, whom Brescia cast forth, at whom Rome shuddered, whom France has banished, whom Germany will soon hold in abomination, whom Italy will not endure, is reported to be with you. Either you know not the man, or hope to convert him. May this be so; but beware of the fatal infection of heresy; he who consorts with the suspected becomes liable to suspicion; he who favors one under the papal excommunication, contravenes the Pope, and even the Lord God himself."<sup>1</sup>

The indefatigable Bernard traced the fugitive Arnold into the diocese of Constance. He wrote in the most vehement language to the bishop denouncing Arnold as the author of tumult and sedition, of insurrection against the clergy, even against bishops, of arraying the laity against the spiritual power. No terms are too harsh; besides the maledictory language of the Psalms, "His mouth is full of cursing and bitterness, and his feet swift to shed blood," he calls him the enemy of the Cross of Christ, the fomentor of discord, the fabricator of schism. He urges the bishop to seize and imprison this wandering disturber of the peace; such had been the Pope's command, but men had shrunk from that good deed. The Bishop of Constance was at least not active in the

<sup>1</sup> Bernardi Epist. The expression "*quem Germania abominabitur*" favors the notion that Guido was Legate in Germany. So hints Guagnani.

pursuit of Arnold. Zurich was again for some time his place of refuge, or rather the Alpine valleys, where, at least from the days of Claudius Bishop of Turin, tenets kindred to his own, and hostile, if not Zurich, to the doctrines, to some of the usages of the Church, to the power and wealth of the clergy, had lurked in the hearts of men. The Waldenses look up to Arnold as to one of the spiritual founders of their churches; and his religious and political opinions probably fostered the spirit of republican independence which throughout Switzerland and the whole Alpine district was awaiting its time.<sup>1</sup>

For five years all traces of Arnold are lost; on a sudden he appears in Rome under the protection of the intrepid champion of the new <sup>Arnold in Rome.</sup> republic which had wrested the sovereignty of the city from the Pope, and had abrogated his right to all temporal possessions. In the foundation of this republic Arnold had personally no concern, but the influence of his doctrines doubtless much. The Popes, who had beheld with satisfaction the rise of the Lombard commonwealths, or openly approved their revolt, were startled to find a republic springing up in Rome itself. Many Romans had crossed the Alps to the school of Abélard; but the practical doctrines of Abélard's scholar were more congenial to their turbulent minds than the abstract lore of the master. Innocent II.

<sup>1</sup> "Nobile Torregium, ductoris nomine falso  
 Insedit, totamque brevi sub tempore terram,  
 Perfidus, impuri fœdavit dogmatis aurâ.  
 Unde venenato dudum corrupta sapore,  
 Et nimium falsi doctrinæ vatis inherens,  
 Servat adhuc uvæ gustum gens illa paternæ."

*Gunther, iii.*

seemed doomed to behold the whole sovereignty, feudal as well as temporal, dissolve in his hands. The wars with Naples to assert his feudal title had ended in the establishment of Roger of Sicily in the independent kingdom of Naples. The Roman passion for liberty was closely allied, as in all the Italian republics, with less generous sentiments — an implacable hatred of liberty in others. There had been a long jealousy between Tivoli and Rome. Tivoli proclaimed its independence of Rome and of the Pope. It had despised the excommunication of the Pope and inflicted a disgraceful defeat on the Romans, as yet the Pope's loyal subjects, under the Pope himself. After a war of at least a year Tivoli was reduced to capitulate ; but Innocent, who perhaps might look hereafter to the strength of Tivoli as a check upon unruly Rome, refused to gratify the revenge of the Romans by dismantling and razing the city walls and dispersing the inhabitants. The Romans turned their baffled vengeance on Innocent himself. Rome assembled in the Capitol, declared itself a republic, restored the senate, proposed to elect a patrician, and either actually withdrew or threatened to withdraw all temporal allegiance from the Pope. But as yet they were but half scholars of Arnold ; they only shook off the yoke of the Pope to place themselves under the yoke of the Emperor. The republicans addressed a letter to the Emperor Conrad, declaring that it was their object to restore the times of Justinian and of Constantine. The Emperor might now rule in the capital of the world, over Germany and Italy, with more full authority than any of his predecessors : all obstacles from the ecclesiastical power were removed ; they concluded with five verses. Let the Emperor do



his will on all his enemies, establish his throne in Rome, and govern the world like another Justinian, and let Peter, according to the commandment of Christ, pay tribute to Cæsar.<sup>1</sup> But they warned him at the same time that his aid must be speedy and strong. "The Pope had made a league with the King of Sicily, whom, in return for large succors to enable him to defy the Emperor, he had invested in all the insignia of royalty. Even in Rome the Pope, the Frangipani, the Sicilians, all the nobles, even the family of Peter Leonis, except their leader Giordano, had conspired to prevent them, the Roman people, from bestowing on Conrad the imperial crown. In order that this army might reach Rome in safety, they had restored the Mil-  
Death of  
Innocent II.  
Sept. 23.  
1143.
vian bridge; but without instant haste all might be lost." In the midst of these tumults Innocent died, closing a Pontificate of fourteen years.

The successor of Innocent was Guido di Castello, the cardinal of St. Mario, the scholar of Abélard, the protector of Arnold. He was elected, from what motive or through what interest does not appear, yet by the unanimous suffrage of the cardinals and amidst the acclamations of the people.<sup>2</sup> He took the  
Sept. 26.  
Cœlestine II.
name of Cœlestine II. The only act of

<sup>1</sup> "Rex valeat, quicquid cupit, obtineat, super hostes  
 Imperium teneat, Romæ sedeat, regat orbem;  
 Princeps terrarum, ceu fecit Justinianus;  
 Cæsar accipiat Cæsar, quæ sunt sua Præsul,  
 Ut Christus jussit, Petro solvente tributum."

*Otho Freisingen*, i. 28.

<sup>2</sup> The Life of Cœlestine is at issue with his own letters. The Life asserts that the people were absolutely excluded from all share in the election. Cœlestine writes: "Clero et populo acclamante, partim et expetente." — *Epist. ad Petr. Venerab.*

Cœlestine was one of gentleness and peace; he received the ambassadors of Louis VII., King of France, pronounced his benediction on the kingdom, and so repealed the Interdict with which Innocent had rewarded the faithful services of his early patron and almost humble vassal.<sup>1</sup> Even the turbulence of the people was overawed; they might seem to await in anxious expectation how far the protector of Arnold might favor their resumption of the Roman liberties.

These hopes were disappointed by the death of Cœlestine after a pontificate of less than six months. On the  
 March 8, 1144. accession of Lucius II., a Bolognese by birth,  
 Lucius II. the republic boldly assumed the ideal form  
 imagined by Arnold of Brescia. The senate and the  
 March 12. people assembled in the Capitol, and elected  
 a Patrician,<sup>2</sup> Giordano, the descendant of Peter Leonis. They announced to the Pope their submission to his spiritual authority, but to his spiritual authority alone. They declared that the Pope and the clergy must content themselves from that time with the tithes and oblations of the people; that all the temporalities, the

<sup>1</sup> The interdict related to the election to the archbishopric of Bourges. The king, according to usage, named a candidate to the chapter. The Pope commanded the obsequious chapter to elect Peter de la Chatre, nephew to the Chancellor of the Roman Church. Even Louis was provoked to wrath; he swore that Peter de la Chatre should never sit as Archbishop of Bourges. "We must teach this young man," said the haughty Pope, "not thus to meddle with the affairs of the Church." He gave the pall to the archbishop, who had fled to Rome. The interdict followed: wherever the King of France appeared, ceased all the divine offices. The interdict was raised by Cœlestine; but Peter de la Chatre was Archbishop of Bourges. — Compare Martin, *Hist. de France*, iii. 434.

<sup>2</sup> This appears from the words of Otho Freisingen: "*Senatoribus, quos ante instituerant, patricium adjiciunt.*" — Otho Freisingen, vii. 31. What place did this leave for the Emperor? I conceive, therefore, that the letter to the Emperor belongs to the pontificate of Innocent, where I have placed it.

royalties, and rights of sovereignty fell to the temporal power, and that power was the Patrician.<sup>1</sup> They proceeded to make themselves masters of the city, attacked and levelled to the ground many of the fortress palaces of the cardinals and the nobles. The Pope, Dec. 28.

after some months, wrote an urgent letter to the Emperor Conrad to claim his protection against his rebellious subjects. To the appeal of the Romans, calling him to the sovereignty, Conrad, spell-bound perhaps by the authority of Bernard, however tempting the occasion might be, paid no attention ; even if more inclined to the cause of the Pope, he had no time for interference. Pope Lucius had recourse to more immediate means of defence. He armed the pontifical party, and that party comprehended all the nobles : it had become a contest of the oligarchy and the democracy. He placed himself at their head, obtained, it should seem, some success,<sup>2</sup> but in an attempt to storm the Capitol in the front of his soldiers he was mortally Feb. 25, 1145. wounded with a stone. To have slain a Pope Death of Lucius II.

afflicted the Romans with no remorse. The papal party felt no shame at the unseemly death of a Pope who had fallen in actual war for the defence of his temporal power ; republican Rome felt no compunction at the fall of her enemy. Yet the death of Lucius seems to have extinguished for a time the ambition of the cardinals. Instead of rival Popes contending for advancement, Pope and Antipope in eager haste to array themselves in the tiara, all seemed to shrink from the perilous dignity. They drew forth from the cloister of

<sup>1</sup> "Ad jus patricii sui reposcunt." — Otho Freisingen, *loc. cit.* This was pure Arnoldism.

<sup>2</sup> "Senatum abrogare coegit." — Cardin. Arragon. in Vita Lucii.

the Cistercian monks the Abbot, Bernard of Pisa, a Eugenius III. devout man, but obscure and of simplicity, it was supposed, bordering on imbecility. His sole recommendation was that he was a Cistercian, a friend of Bernard of Clairvaux, of Bernard the tried foe of Abélard and of Arnold of Brescia, Bernard through whom alone they could hope for the speedy succor of the Transalpine sovereigns. "In electing you," says Bernard himself, "they made me Pope, not you."<sup>1</sup> The saint's letter of congratulation is in a tone of mingled superiority and deference, in which the deference is formal, the superiority manifest. To the conclave Bernard remonstrated against the cruelty, almost the impiety, of dragging a man dead to the world back into the peril and turmoil of worldly affairs. He spoke almost with contempt of the rude character of Eugenius III. "Is this a man to gird on the sword and to execute vengeance on the people, to bind their kings with chains and their nobles with links of iron?" (Such at present appeared to Bernard the office of Christ's representative on earth!) "How will a man with the innocence and simplicity of a child cope with affairs which require the strength of a giant?"<sup>2</sup> Bernard was for once mistaken in his estimate of human character. Eugenius III. belied all expectations by the unsuspected vigor of his conduct. He was compelled, indeed, at first to bow before the storm: on the third day after his election he left Rome to receive his consecration in the monastery of Farfa.

Arnold of Brescia at the head of a large force of Swiss mountaineers who had imbibed his doctrines, was

<sup>1</sup> "Aiunt non vos esse papam, sed me." — Epist. 237, 8.

<sup>2</sup> Epist. 236. He calls him "pannosum homuncionem."

now in Rome.<sup>1</sup> His eloquence brought over <sup>Arnold in</sup> the larger part of the nobles to the popular <sup>Rome.</sup> side; even some of the clergy were infected by his doctrines. The republic, under his influence, affected to resume the constitution of elder Rome. The office of prefect was abolished, the Patrician Giordano established in full authority. They pretended to create anew patrician families, an equestrian order; the name and rights of tribunes of the people were to balance the power of the Senate; the laws of the commonwealth were reënacted.<sup>2</sup> Nor were they forgetful of more substantial provisions for their power. The Capitol was rebuilt and fortified; even the church of St. Peter was sacrilegiously turned into a castle. The Patrician took possession of the Vatican, imposed taxes, and exacted tribute by violence from the pilgrims. Rome began again to speak of her sovereignty over the world. On the expulsion of Eugenius, the indefatigable Bernard addressed a letter to the Roman people in his usual tone of haughty apology for his interference; a protest of his own insignificance while he was dictating to nations and kings. He mingles what he means for gentle persuasion with the language of awful menace. "Not only will the powers of earth, but the martyrs of heaven fight against a rebellious people." In one

<sup>1</sup> "Arnoldus Alpinorum turbam ad se traxit et Romam cum multitudine venit." — *Fasti Corbeienses*. See Muller, Schweitzer's *Geschichte*, i. 409, u. 277. Eugen., *Epist.* 4.

<sup>2</sup> "Quin etiam titulos urbis renovare vetustos,  
 Patricios recreare viros, priscosque Quirites,  
 Nomine plebeio secernere nomen equestre;  
 Jura tribunorum, sanctum reparare senatum;  
 Et senio fessas, mutasque reponere leges;  
 Reddere primevo Capitolia prisca nitore."

*Gunther.*



part, he dexterously inquires how far they themselves had become richer by the plunder of the churches. It was as the religious capital of the world that Rome was great and wealthy ; they were cutting off all their real glory and riches by ceasing to be the city of St. Peter.<sup>1</sup> In another letter, he called on the Emperor Conrad to punish this accursed and tumultuous people.

But Eugenius owed to his own intrepid energy and conduct at least a temporary success. He Eugenius re-  
covers Rome. launched his sentence of excommunication against the rebel Patrician : Rome was too much accustomed to such thunders to regard them. He appealed to more effective arms, the implacable hatred and jealousy of the neighboring cities. Tivoli was always ready to take arms against Rome, (Innocent II. had foreseen the danger of dismantling this check on Rome,) other cities sent their troops ; Eugenius was in person at Civita Castellana, Narni, Viterbo, where he took up his residence. The proud republic was compelled to capitulate. The Patrician abdicated his short-lived dignity ; the Prefect resumed his functions ; the Senate was permitted to exist, but shorn of its power.<sup>2</sup> A general amnesty was granted to all concerned in the late commotions. Some of the Roman nobles, the great family of the Frangipani, out of rivalry perhaps to the Peter Leonis, had remained faithful to the Pope.

A.D. 1145-  
1146. Eugenius returned to Rome, and celebrated Christmas with pomp at least sufficient to give an appearance of popularity to his resumption of author-

<sup>1</sup> Epist. 242, 243.

<sup>2</sup> In the few fragments of the historians we trace the influence, but little of the personal history of Arnold. We know not whether he remained in Rome during the short triumph of Eugenius.

ity: he was attended by some of the nobles, and all the clergy.

But without the walls of Rome, at the head of a hostile army, the Pope was an object of awe; within the city with only his Roman partisans, he was powerless. He might compel Rome to abandon her republican constitution, he could not her hatred of Tivoli. Under this black standard rallied all her adversaries: only on the condition of his treachery to Tivoli, which had befriended him in his hour of necessity, would Rome continue to obey him. Eugenius left the city in disgust; he retired first to Viterbo, then to Sienna; eventually, after the delay of a year, beyond the Alps.<sup>1</sup> Arnold and Arnold's republic resumed uncontested possession of the capital of Christendom.

Beyond the Alps the Cistercian Pontiff sank into the satellite of the great Cistercian ruler of Christendom. The Pope maintained the state, the authority was with St. Bernard. Three subjects, before the arrival of Eugenius in France, had occupied the indefatigable thoughts of Bernard. The two first display his all-grasping command of the mind of Christendom; but it was the last which so completely absorbed his soul, that succors to the Pope struggling against his rebellious subjects, the sovereignty of Rome, might seem beneath his regard.

The Abbot of Clairvaux was involved in a disputed election to the Archbishopric of York. The narrow corporate spirit of his order betrayed him into great and crying injustice to William, the elected prelate of that See. The rival of the English-

Eugenius  
flies.  
March 23,  
1146.

In France.

Bernard and  
William of  
York.

<sup>1</sup> He was at Vercelli, March 3, 1147; at Clugny, 26; at Dijon, 30.

man, another William, once a Cluniac, was a Cistercian; and Bernard scruples not to heap on one of the most pious of men accusations of ambition, of worse than ambition: to condemn him to everlasting perdition.<sup>1</sup> The obsequious Pope, no doubt under the same party influence, or quailing under the admonitions of Bernard, which rise into menace, issued his sentence of deposition against William. England, true to that independence which she had still asserted under her Norman sovereigns, refused obedience. King Stephen even prohibited his bishops from attending the Pope's summons to a Council at Rheims; the Archbishop of Canterbury was obliged to cross the sea clandestinely in a small boat.<sup>2</sup> William eventually triumphed over all opposition, obtained peaceable possession of the see, died in the odor of sanctity, and has his place in the sacred calendar.

Bernard had detected new heresies in the church of France. Gilbert de la Porée, the aged Bishop of Poitiers, was charged with heterodox conceptions of the divine nature.<sup>3</sup> This controversy wearied out two Councils; bewildered by the metaphysical sub-

Gilbert de la  
Porée.

<sup>1</sup> "Epist. 241. "Sævit frustrata ambitio: imo desperata fuit. . . . Clamat contra eorum capita sanguis sanctorum de terrâ." "St. William showed no enmity, sought no revenge against his most inveterate enemies, who had prepossessed Eugenius III. against him by the blackest calumnies." — Butler, *Lives of Saints*.

<sup>2</sup> June 8th. St. William. Was Bernard imposed upon, or the author of these calumnies? It is a dark page in his life.

<sup>3</sup> Otho of Freisingen, however, ascribes two other tenets to Gilbert, one denying all human merit; the other, a peculiar opinion on baptism. "Quod meritum humanum attenuando, nullum mereri diceret præter Christum." He appeared too to deny that any one was really baptized, except those who were to be saved. — Otho Freisingen. i. 50. M. Haureau (*Philosophie Scolastique*) has a much higher opinion of Gilbert de la Porée as an original thinker than the historians of philosophy previous to him. — vol. i. c. xviii.

tilties they came to no conclusion. It was, in fact, in its main article, a mere dialectic dispute, bearing on the point whether the divine nature was God. It was Nominalism and Realism in another form. But the close of this contest demands attention. The Bishop of Poitiers, instead of shrinking from his own words, in a discussion before the Pope, who was now at Paris, exclaimed: — “Write them down with a pen of adamant!” Notwithstanding this, under the influence and direction of Bernard four articles were drawn and ratified by the Synod. The Pope himself, worn out, acknowledged that the controversy was beyond his understanding. These articles were the direct converse to those of Gilbert of Poitiers. They declared the divine nature to be God, and God the divine nature. But Rome heard with indignation that the Church of France had presumed to enact articles of faith. The Cardinals published a strong remonstrance impeaching the Pope of presumption; of abandoning the advice of his legitimate counsellors, who had promoted him to the Papacy; and yielding to the sway of private, of more recent friendship.<sup>1</sup> “It is not for thee alone, but for us with thee to frame articles of faith. Is this good Abbot to presume to dictate to Christendom? The Eastern churches would not have dared to do this.” The Pope endeavored to soothe them by language almost apologetic; they allowed themselves at length to be appeased by his modest words, but on condition that no

<sup>1</sup> The Bishop Otho of Freisingen writes thus of Bernard: “Erat autem prædictus Abbas, tam ex Christianæ religionis fervore zelotypus, quam ex habituali mansuetudine quodammodo credulus, ut et magistros, qui humanis rationibus, sæculari sapientiæ confisi, nimium inhærebant, abhorreret, et si quidquam ei Christianæ fidei absonum de talibus diceretur facile aurem præberet.” — *De Rebus Freder. I.*, i. 47.

symbol of faith should be promulgated without the authority of the Roman court, the College of Cardinals.

These, however, were trivial and unimportant considerations. Before and during the agitation of these contests, the whole soul of Bernard was absorbed in a greater object: he aspired to be a second Peter the Hermit, the preacher of a new crusade. The fall of Edessa, and other tidings of defeat and disaster, had awakened the slumbering ardor of Europe. The kingdom of Jerusalem trembled for its security. Peter himself was not more active or more successful in traversing Europe, and wakening the passionate valor of all orders, than Bernard. In the cities of Germany, of Burgundy, of Flanders, of France, the pulpits were open to him; he preached in the market-places and highways. Nor did he depend upon human eloquence alone: according to his wandering followers, eye-witnesses as they declared themselves, the mission of Bernard was attested by miracles, at least as frequent and surprising as all those of the Saviour, recorded in the New Testament. They, no doubt, imagined that they believed them, and no one hesitated to believe their report. In sermons, in speeches, in letters, by public addresses, and by his private influence, Bernard wrought up Latin Christendom to a second access of frenzy equal to the first.<sup>1</sup> The Pope, Eugenius III., probably at his instigation, addressed an animated epistle to Western Christendom. He promised the same privileges offered by his predecessor Urban, the remission of all sins, the protection of the crusaders' estates and families during their absence in the Holy Land under the tutelage of

<sup>1</sup> Epist. to the Pope Eugenius, 256; to the Bishop of Spire, 322.



the Church ; and he warned them against profane luxury in their arms and accoutrements ; against hawks and hounds, while engaged in that hallowed warfare. Bernard preached a sermon to the Knights Templars, now in the dawn of their valor and glory. The Korân is tame to this fierce hymn of battle. “ The Christian who slays the unbeliever in the Holy War is sure of his reward, more sure if he is slain. The Christian glories in the death of the Pagan, because Christ is glorified : by his own death both he himself and Christ are still more glorified.” Bernard at the Council of Vezelay wrought no less wonderful effects than Pope Urban at Clermont. Eugenius alone, who had not yet crossed, or had hardly crossed the Alps, was wanting at that august assembly, but in a letter he had declared that nothing but the disturbances at Rome prevented him from following the example of his predecessor Urban. A greater than the Pope was there. The Castle of Vezelay could not contain the multitudes who thronged to hear the fervid eloquence of Bernard. The preacher, with the King of France Louis VII. by his side, who wore the cross conspicuously on his dress, ascended a platform of wood. At the close of his harangue the whole assembly broke out in tumultuous cries, “ The Cross, the Cross ! ” They crowded to the stage to receive the holy badge ; the preacher was obliged to scatter it among them, rather than deliver it to each. The stock at hand was soon exhausted. Bernard tore up his own dress to satisfy the eager claimants. For the first time, the two greatest sovereigns in Christendom, the Emperor and the King of France, embarked in the cause. Louis had appeared at Vezelay ; he was taking measures for the

Easter, 1146.  
Vezelay.

campaign. But Conrad shrank from the perilous enterprise; the affairs of Germany demanded the unintermitting care of her sovereign. Bernard watched his opportunity. At a great Diet at Spire, at Christmas, after the reconciliation of some of the rebellious princes with the Empire, he urged both the Emperor and the princes, in a long and ardent sermon, to testify to their Christian concord by taking the Cross together. Three days after, at Ratisbon, he had a private interview with the Emperor. Conrad still wavered, promised to consult his nobles, and to give an answer on the following day. On that day, after the mass, Bernard ascended the pulpit. At the close of his sermon, he turned to the Emperor, and after a terrific description of the terrors of the Last Day, he summoned him to think of the great gifts, for which he would have to give account at that awful advent of the Lord. The Emperor and the whole audience melted into tears; he declared himself ready to take the Cross: he was at once invested with the irrevocable sign of dedication to the holy warfare; many of his nobles followed his example. Bernard, for all was prepared, took the consecrated banner from the altar, and delivered it into the hands of Conrad. Three bishops, Henry of Ratisbon, Otho of Freisingen, Reginbert of Padua, took the Cross. Such a multitude of thieves and robbers crowded to the sacred standard, that no one could refuse to see the hand of God.<sup>1</sup> Nowhere would even kings proceed without the special benediction of Bernard. At Etampes, and at St. Denys in the next year, he appeared among the assembled crusaders of France. The Pope Eugenius was now in France; the King at

<sup>1</sup> Otho Freisingen, i. 40.

St. Denys prostrated himself before the feet of his Holiness and of Bernard ; they opened a box of golden crucifixes ; they led him to the altar <sup>Pentecost,</sup> <sup>May 11, 1147.</sup> and bestowed on him the consecrated banner, the pilgrim's wallet and staff. At another meeting at Chartres, Bernard, so great was the confidence in his more than human powers, was entreated himself to take the command of the crusade. But he wisely remembered the fate of Peter's followers, and exhorted the warriors to place themselves under the command of some experienced general.

But there was a miracle of Christian love, as far surpassing in its undoubted veracity as in its evangelic beauty all which legend gathered around the preaching pilgrimage of Bernard. The crusade began ; a wild monk named Rodolph raised the terrible cry against the Jews, which was even more greedily <sup>The Jews.</sup> than before heard by the populace of the great cities, and by the armed soldiers. In Cologne, Mentz, Spire, Worms, Strasburg, a massacre the most frightful and remorseless broke out. Bernard arose in all his power and authority. He condemned the unchristian act in his strongest language. " God had punished the Jews by their dispersion, it was not for man to punish them by murder." Bernard himself confronted the furious Rodolph at Mentz, and commanded him to retire to his convent ; but it required all the sanctity and all the eloquence of Bernard to control the furious populace, now drunk with blood and glutted with pillage.<sup>1</sup> Among the most melancholy reflections, it is not the

<sup>1</sup> Otho Freisingen, i. 37, 8. It is curious that the two modern biographers of St. Bernard, Neander and M. de Ratisbonne, were once Jews. Their works are labors of gratitude as well as of love.

least sad that the gentle Abbot of Clugny, Peter the Venerable, still to be opposed to Bernard, took the side of blind fanaticism.

Of all these holy wars, none had been announced with greater ostentation, of none had it been more boldly averred that it was of divine inspiration, the work of God; of none had the hopes, the prophecies of success been more confident; none had been conducted with so much preparation and pomp; none had as yet been headed by kings — none ended in such total and deplorable disaster. So vast had been the movement, so completely had the West been drained to form the army of the Cross, that not merely had all war come to an end, but it was almost a crime, writes the warlike Bishop of Freisingen, to be seen in arms. “The cities and the castles are empty,” writes Bernard, “there is hardly one man to seven women.” What was the close? At least thirty thousand lives were sacrificed and there was not even the consolation of one glorious deed achieved. The Emperor, the King of France, returned to their dominions, the ignominious survivors of their gallant hosts! But would the general and bitter disappointment of Christendom, the widowed and orphaned houses, the families, scarcely one of which had not to deplore their head, their pride, their hope, or their stay, still respect the author of all these calamities? Was this the event of which Bernard had been the preacher, the prophet? Were all his miracles wrought only to plunge Christendom in shame and misery? There was a deep and sullen murmur against Bernard, and Bernard himself was prostrated for a time in profound depression. But this disappointment found its usual consolation. Ber-

Disasters of  
the Crusade.

nard still declared that he had spoken with the authority of the Pope, with the authority of God.<sup>1</sup> The first cause of failure was the perfidy of the Greeks. The Bishop of Langres had boldly advised the measure which was accomplished by a later crusade, the seizure of Constantinople; and with still more fervent hatred and contempt for the Greeks, whom they overwhelmed, starved, insulted on the passage through their dominions, the crusaders complained of their inhospitality, of the unchristian lukewarmness of their friendship. But the chief blame of their disasters was thrown back on the crusaders themselves; on the license and unchastity of their camp. God would not be served by soldiers guilty of such sins; sins which human prudence might have anticipated as the inevitable consequence of discharging upon a distant land undisciplined and uncontrolled hordes, all the ruffians and robbers of Europe, whose only penance was to be the slaughter of unbelievers.<sup>2</sup> The Pope wrote a letter of consolation, cold consolation, to the Emperor Conrad; the admirers of Bernard excuse him by condemning themselves. But the boldest tone of consolation was taken by a monk named John. Not only did he assure Bernard that he knew from Heaven that many who had died in the Holy Land died with joy because they were prevented from returning to the wicked world, but in private confession he averred that the patron saints of his monastery, St. Peter and St. John, had appeared and

<sup>1</sup> "Diximus pax et non est pax: promissimus bona et ecce turbatio . . . Cucurrimus planè in eo non quasi in incertum, sed te jubente et imò per te Deo." — See the whole passage, *De Consider.* ii. 1.

<sup>2</sup> "Quamvis si dicamus sanctum illum Abbatem spiritu Dei ad excitandos nos afflatum fuisse, sed nos ob superbiam, lasciviamque nostram . . . merito rerum personarumque dispendium deportasse," &c. — *Otho Freising.* i. 60.



submitted to be interrogated on this mournful subject. The Apostles declared that the places of many of the fallen angels had been filled up by the Christian warriors who had died for the Cross in the Holy Land. The Apostles had likewise a fervent desire for the presence of the holy Bernard among them.<sup>1</sup>

Only a few years elapsed before Bernard, according A.D. 1153. to the general judgment of Christendom, fulfilled the vision of the monk, and departed to the society of Saints, Apostles, and Angels.

The Saint, the Philosopher, the Demagogue of the century have passed before us (the end of the last is to come): it may be well to contemplate also the high ecclesiastical statesman. Suger, Abbot of St. Denys, has been sometimes represented as the unambitious Richelieu, the more honest Mazarin of his Suger of St. Denys. age. But Suger was the Minister of Kings of France, whose realm in his youth hardly reached beyond four or five modern departments; whose power was so limited that the road between Paris and Orleans, their two great cities, was commanded by the castle of a rebellious noble.<sup>2</sup> But though the fame of Suger be unwisely elevated by such comparisons, the historic facts remain, that during the reigns of the two Kings, Louis the Fat, and Louis the Young, of whom Suger was the chief counsellor, order was restored, royal authority became more than a name, the great vassals of the crown were brought into something more nearly approaching to subordination. If France became France, and from the Meuse to the Pyrenees some respect and homage belonged to the King; if some cities obtained charters

<sup>1</sup> Bernardi Opera, Epist. 333.

<sup>2</sup> Sismondi, Hist. des Français, v. pp. 7-20.

of freedom ; however the characters of the Kings and the circumstances of the times may have had greater actual influence than the administration of Suger, yet much must have been due to his wisdom and firmness.

Suger was born of obscure parentage at St. Omer, in 1081. He was received at fifteen in the <sup>His birth.</sup>

Abbey of St. Denys. He became the companion of the King's son, educated at that abbey. In 1098 he went to finish his studies at St. Florent, in Saumur. He returned to St. Denys about the age of twenty-two.

In the wars of Louis, first named the Watchful,<sup>1</sup> an appellation ill-exchanged for that of the <sup>Education</sup> Fat, the young monk of St. Denys scrupled <sup>and early life.</sup> not to wield a lance and to head the soldiers of the Abbey ; for the King's domains and those of the Abbey of St. Denys, as annoyed by common enemies, were bound in close alliance, and were nearly of the same extent ; the soldiers of St. Denys formed a large contingent in the royal army. The Abbot relates, not without some proud reminiscences, how, while yet a monk, he broke gallantly through the marauding hosts of Hugh de Poinset, and threw himself into Theury ; he describes the joy "of our men" at his unexpected appearance, which encouraged them to a des-

perate rally, and saved Theury, a post of the utmost importance, for the King. Suger became the ambassador of the two great powers, the King and the Abbot of St. Denys, to the Court of Rome. He was sent to welcome Pope Gelasius, when, after the death of Paschal, he fled to France. Yet he could not lament the death of Gelasius : the prudent Suger did not wish to

<sup>1</sup> L'Eveillé.

commit France in a quarrel with the Romans.<sup>1</sup> Suger hailed the elevation of the half-French Pope, Calixtus II. He went on the King's affairs to Rome; and followed Calixtus into Apulia. On his return he had a remarkable and prophetic vision, and woke to the re-Suger abbot. ality. On the death of Abbot Adam he had been chosen to the high place of Abbot of St. Denys. But the churchman and the courtier were committed in dire perplexity within him. The election had taken place without the King's permission. Louis, in fury, had committed the monks and knights of the Abbey to prison at Orleans. Should he brave the King's wrath, throw himself on the power of the Pope, and compel A.D. 1123. the King to submission? or was he tamely to surrender the rights of the Church? Louis, however, he found to his delight, had, after some thought, approved his election.

From that time Suger became the first counsellor, if not the minister of the king. The Abbey of St. Denys was the centre of the affairs of France. The restless, all-watchful piety of St. Bernard took alarm at this secularization of the holy foundation of St. Denys. He wrote a long, lofty rebuke to the abbot; he reproofed St. Bernard. his temporal pomp, his temporal business. "The abbey was thronged, not with holy recluses in continual prayer within the chapel, or on their knees within their narrow cells, but with mailed knights; even arms were seen within the hallowed walls. If that which was of Cæsar was given to Cæsar, that of God was not given to God." Suger himself had never

<sup>1</sup> Les Nôtres. Suger, Vie de Louis le Gros, in Guizot's Mémoires. Siege of Theury. "Il avait ainsi, en quittant la vie, épargné une querelle aux Français et aux Romains." — Ibid.

thrown off the severe monk ; the king's minister lodged in a close cell, ten feet by fifteen ; he performed with punctilious austerity all the outward duties, he indulged in all the minute self-tortures of his cloister. Throughout the rest of the reign of Louis the Fat, and the commencement of that of Louis the Young, during which the kingly power was gradually growing up in strength and authority, Suger ruled in the king's councils. When the irresistible eloquence of St. Bernard<sup>1</sup> swept Louis the Young, with the rest of Europe, to the Holy Land, Suger alone had the courage to oppose the abandonment of the royal duties in this wild enterprise : he opposed in vain. Yet by the unanimous voice Suger remained for two years chief of the re-<sup>From 1147 to 1149.</sup>gency ; the Archbishop of Rouen and the Count of Vermandois held but a secondary authority. On the return of the king, the regent abbot could appeal in honest pride to his master, whether he had not maintained the realm in unwonted peace (the more turbulent barons had no doubt accompanied the king to the Holy Land), supplied him with ample means in money, in warlike stores, in men ; his palaces and domains were in admirable state. The Regent yielded up his trust, the kingdom of France, in a better state than it had been during the reign of the Capets. Suger the statesman had endeavored to dissuade the king from the crusade, but from no want of profound religious zeal. In his old age, at seventy years, the Abbot of St. Denys himself proposed to embark on a crusade : he would consecrate all his own wealth ; he would persuade the bishops to devote their ample revenues to this holy cause ; and thus the Church might

<sup>1</sup> Read the whole of the 78th epistle. — Bernardi Opera.

conquer Jerusalem without loss or damage to the realm Jan. 13, 1152. of France. Death cut short his holy design ; he died the year before St. Bernard, who, notwithstanding his rebuke, and the opposition to his views on the Holy Land, admired and loved the Abbot of St. Denys. It may be some further homage to the high qualities of Abbot Suger (without exalting him beyond the narrow sphere in which he moved), that after his death begins the feeble and inglorious part of the reign of Louis VII. — Louis himself sinks into a slave of superstition. Suger was an historian as well as a statesman ; but he administered better than he wrote ; though not without some graphic powers, his history is somewhat pompous, but without dignity ; it has many of the monkish failings without their occasional beauty and simplicity.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See throughout Suger, *Vit. Louis Gr.*, and the *Life of Suger*, in *Latin in Bouquet*, in French in Guizot's *Collection des Mémoires*.



## CHAPTER VII.

## HADRIAN IV.—FREDERICK BARBAROSSA.

IN the same year with Bernard died the friend of Bernard, the Cistercian Pope, Eugenius III. He had returned to Italy after the departure of the crusade. He took up his abode, not at Rome, but at first at Viterbo, afterwards at Tusculum. <sup>Nov. 30, 1148.</sup> There was a period of hostility, probably of <sup>April 8, 1149.</sup> open war, with the republic at Rome. But the temper or the policy of Eugenius led him to milder measures. The republic disclaimed not the spiritual su- <sup>Nov. 28, 1149.</sup> premacy of the Pope, and Eugenius scrupled not to enter the city only as its bishop, not as its Lord. The first time he remained not long, and retired into Campania ; <sup>1</sup> the second time, the year before <sup>Dec. 9, 1152.</sup> his death, the skilful and well-timed use of means more becoming the Head of Christendom than arms and excommunications, wrought wonders in his favor ; by his gentleness, his lavish generosity, his magnificence (he built a palace near St. Peter's, another at Segni), and his charity, he was slowly supplanting the senate in the popular attachment ; the fierce and in-

<sup>1</sup> He was at Alba, June; at Segni, October?; Ferentino, November, December, part of 1152. Then again at Segni. — Cardin. Arragon. in Vit. He is also said to have recovered some parts of the papal domains. From whom?

tractable people were yielding to this gentler influence.

Sept. 7, Arnold of Brescia found his power gradually  
1152. wasting away from the silent counter-work-

ing of the clergy, from the fickleness, perhaps the reasonable disappointment of the people, who yearned again for the glory and the advantage of being the religious capital of the world — the centre of pilgrimage, of curiosity, of traffic, of business, from all parts of the world. The Archbishops of Cologne and Mentz came in all their pomp and extravagance of expenditure to Rome; for the first time they were sent back with their treasures.<sup>1</sup> Eugenius, in the spirit of an ancient Roman, or a true Cistercian, refused their magnificent offerings, or rather their bribes. It may be questioned whether the republicans of Rome were the most sincere admirers of this unwonted contempt of riches shown by the Pope. The death of Eugenius alone preserved the republic from an earlier but less violent fate than it suffered at last.<sup>2</sup> He died at Tiv-

July 7, 1153.

Death of  
Eugenius.

oli, but his remains were received in Rome with the utmost respect, and buried in the Vatican. The fame of miraculous cures around his tomb showed how strong the Pope still remained in the affections and reverence of the common people.

The Republic, true to its principles, did not, like the turbulent Roman nobles, or the heads of factions in the former century, interfere, either by force or intrigue, in the election of the Popes. The cardinals quietly raised Conrad, Bishop of Sabina, a Roman by birth, to

<sup>1</sup> "Nova res. Quando hactenus aurum Roma refudit?" — Bernard. de Consid. iii. 3.

<sup>2</sup> "Et nisi esset mors amula, quæ illum cito de medio rapuit, senatores noviter procreatos populi adminiculo usurpatâ dignitate privasset." — Romuald. Salern. in Chron.

the pontifical chair with the name of Anastasius IV. On the death of Anastasius, after, it should Dec. 2, 1154. seem a peaceful rule of one year and five Hadrian IV. Dec. 4 months, the only Englishman who ever filled the papal chair was raised to the supremacy over Christendom.

Nicolas Breakspeare, born, according to one account, at St. Alban's,<sup>1</sup> wandered forth from his country in search of learning; he was received into a monastery at Arles; became a brother, prior, abbot. He went to Rome on the affairs of his community, and so won the favor of the Pope Eugenius that he was detained in his court, was raised to the cardinalate, undertook a mission as legate to Norway,<sup>2</sup> and, something in the character of the old English apostles of Germany, confirmed that hard won kingdom in its allegiance to the see of Rome. Nicolas Breakspeare was a man of exemplary morals, high fame for learning, and great eloquence: and now the poor English scholar, homeless, except in the home which he found in the hospitable convent; friendless, except among the friends which he has made by his abilities, his virtues, and his piety; with no birth or connections to advance his claims; is become the Head of Christendom — the Lord of Rome, which surrenders her liberties before his feet — the Pontiff from whose hands the mightiest and proudest

<sup>1</sup> Cardinal Arragon in Vitâ. He was Bishop of Alba. Perhaps the notion of his birth at St. Alban's arose from his being called Albanus.

<sup>2</sup> Norway was slowly converted, not by preachers or bishops, but by her kings; by Harold the Fair-haired, Hacon Athelstan, Olaf Trigvesen — Saint Olaf — not with apostolic persuasion, but with the Mohammedan proselytism of the sword. And a strange, wild Christianity it was, worthy of its origin; but it softened down by degrees into Christianity. — See Bishop Munter, *Einführung des Christenthums in Dänemark und Norwegen*, latter part of vol. i.

Emperor is glad to receive his crown ! What pride, what hopes, might such a promotion awaken in the lowest of the sacerdotal order throughout Christendom ! In remote England not a youthful scholar but may have had visions of pontifical grandeur ! This had been at all times wonderful, how much more so in the age of feudalism, in which the pride of birth was paramount !

Nor did Hadrian IV. yield to any of his loftiest predecessors in his assertion of the papal dignity ; he was surpassed by few in the boldness and courage with which he maintained it. The views of unlimited power which opened before the new pontiff appear most manifestly in his grant of Ireland to Henry II. of England. English pride might mingle with sacerdotal ambition in this boon of a new kingdom to his native sovereign. The language of the grant developed principles as yet unheard in Christendom. The Popes had assumed the feudal sovereignty of Naples and Sicily, as in some vague way the successors to the power of Imperial Rome. But Hadrian declared that Ireland and all islands converted to Christianity belonged to the special jurisdiction of St. Peter.<sup>1</sup> He assumed the right of sanctioning the invasion, on the ground of its advancing civilization and propagating a purer faith among the barbarous and ignorant people. The tribute of Peter's pence from the conquered island was to be the reward of the Pope's munificence in granting the island to the English, and his

<sup>1</sup> "Sanè Hiberniam et omnes insulas, quibus Sol justitiæ Christus illuxit, et quæ documenta fidei Christianæ receperunt, ad jus B. Patri et sacrosanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ, quod tua etiam nobilitas recognoscit, non est dubium pertinere." — Rymér, *Fœdera*, i. 19 ; Wilken, *Concil.* i. 426 ; Radulf de Diceto.

recognition of Henry's sovereignty. The prophetic ambition of Hadrian might seem to have anticipated the time, when on such principles the Popes should assume the power of granting away new worlds.

But Hadrian had first to bring rebellious Rome under his sway. The mild measures of Pope Eugenius had undermined the power of Arnold of Brescia. Hadrian had the courage to confront him with open hostility. He vouchsafed no answer to the haughty demands of the republic to recognize its authority; he pronounced sentence of banishment from the city against Arnold himself. Arnold denied the power of the Pope to issue such sentence. But an opportunity soon occurred in which Hadrian, without exceeding his spiritual power, bowed the whole rebellious people under his feet. The Cardinal of San Pudenziana, on his way to the Pope, who was in the palace raised on the Vatican by Eugenius III., encountered a tumult of the populace, and received a mortal wound. Hadrian instantly placed the whole city under an interdict. <sup>Rome under interdict.</sup> Rome for the first time was deprived of all its religious ceremonies. No procession moved through the silent streets; the people thronged around the closed doors of the churches; the clergy, their functions entirely suspended, had nothing to do but to inflame the minds of the populace. <sup>Easter, March 27, 1155.</sup> Easter was drawing on; no mass could atone for, no absolution release them from their sins. Religion triumphed over liberty. The clergy and the people compelled the senate to yield. Hadrian would admit of no lower terms than the abrogation of the republican institutions; the banishment of <sup>Fall of the Republic.</sup> Arnold and his adherents. The republic was at an



end, Arnold an exile; the Pope again master in Rome.

But all this time great events were passing in the north of Italy; events which, however in some respects menacing to Pope Hadrian, might encourage him in his inflexible hostility to the republicans of Rome.<sup>1</sup> On the death of Conrad, Germany with one consent had placed the crown on the head of the great

Frederick Hohenstaufen prince, his nephew, Frederick Barbarossa. If the Papacy under Hadrian had resumed all its haughty authority, the Empire was wielded with a terrible force, which it had hardly ever displayed before. Frederick was a prince of intrepid valor, consummate prudence, unmeasured ambition, justice which hardened into severity, the ferocity of a barbarian somewhat tempered with a high chivalrous gallantry; above all with a strength of character which subjugated alike the great temporal and ecclesiastical princes of Germany; and was prepared to assert the imperial rights in Italy to the utmost. Of the constitutional rights of the Emperor, of his unlimited supremacy, his absolute independence of, his temporal superiority over, all other powers, even that of the Pope, Frederick proclaimed the loftiest notions. He was to the Empire what Hildebrand and Innocent were to the popedom. His power was of God alone; to assert that

<sup>1</sup> Compare the curious account given by John of Salisbury of conversations with Pope Hadrian, with whom, on account probably of his English connections, he may have been on intimate terms. The condition of the Pope is most laborious, is most miserable. "Si enim avaritiæ servit, mors ei est. Sin autem, non effugiat manus et linguas Romanorum. Nisi enim noseat unde obstruat eorum ora manusque cohibeat, ad flagitia et sacrilegia perferenda omnes oculos duret et animam . . . nisi servirent, aut ex Pontificem, aut ex-Romanum esse necesse est." — Polycratic. L. viii. p. 324 and 366, edit. Giles.

it is bestowed by the successor of St. Peter was a lie, and directly contrary to the doctrine of St. Peter.<sup>1</sup>

In the autumn of the year of Hadrian's accession Frederick descended the Alps by the valley of Trent. Never had a more imposing might assembled around any of his predecessors than around Frederick on the plains of Roncaglia. He came to receive the iron crown of Italy from the Lombards, the End of November, 1154. imperial crown from the Pope at Rome. He had summoned all the feudatories of the Empire, all the feudatories of Italy, to his banner, declaring himself determined to enforce the forfeiture of their fiefs if they refused to obey. The Bishops of Crema and of Halberstadt were deprived, as contumacious, for their lives, of their temporalities.<sup>2</sup> The great prelates of Germany, instead of fomenting disturbances in the Empire, were in the army of Frederick. The Archbishops of Cologne and Mentz were at the head of their vassals. The Lombard cities, most of which had now become republics, hastened to send their deputies to acknowledge their fealty. The Marquis of Montferrat appeared, it is said, the only ruling prince in the north of Italy. Pavia, Genoa, Lodi, Crema, vied in their loyalty; even haughty Milan, which had trampled under foot Frederick's mandate commanding peace with Lodi,

<sup>1</sup> "Quum per electionem principum a solo Deo regnum et imperium nostrum sit, qui in passione Christi filii sui duobus gladiis necessariis regendum orbem subjecit, quumque Petrus Apostolus hac doctrinâ mundum informaverit: Deum timeate, regem honorificate; quicumque nos imperialem coronam pro beneficio a domino Papa suscepisse dixerit, divinæ institutioni et doctrinæ Petri contrarius est et mendacii reus est." — Otho Freisingen, apud Muratori, vi. 709. Compare Eichhorn on the Constitution of the Empire, from the Swabische Spiegel and the Sachsische Spiegel, ii. pp. 364, *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> Muratori, Ann. d'Italia sub ann.

sent her consuls.<sup>1</sup> The Duke Guelf of Bavaria, under the protection of the Emperor, took quiet possession of the domains of the Countess Matilda; <sup>2</sup> it was no time for the Pope even to enter a protest. Frederick appeared with the iron crown in the Church of St. Michael at Pavia.<sup>3</sup> There was just resistance enough to show the terrible power, the inflexible determination of Frederick. At the persuasion of faithful Pavia, Frederick laid siege to Tortona: notwithstanding the bravest resistance, the city fell through famine and thirst.<sup>4</sup> Frederick now directed his march to the south.

Hadrian had watched all the movements of Frederick with jealous apprehension. The haughty King had not yet declared his disposition towards the Church; nor was it known with certainty whether he would take part with the people of Rome, or with their Pontiff. Hadrian was at Viterbo with the leaders of his party, the Frangipani, and Peter the prefect of the city. He sent forward an embassy of three cardinals, St. John and St. Paul, St. Pudenziana, St. Maria in Portico, who met Frederick at San Quirico. Among the first articles which the Pope enforced on the Emperor as the price of his coronation was the surrender of Arnold of Brescia into his hands. The Emperor and the Pope were united by the bonds of common interest and common dread and hatred of republicanism. Hadrian wanted the aid of Frederick to suppress the still powerful and now rallying faction in Rome.

<sup>1</sup> Von Raumer, p. 18; Geschichte der Hohenstaufen, viii. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Frederick's first descent into Italy is fully and clearly related by Von Raumer.

<sup>3</sup> April 17, 1155. Muratori, sub ann.

<sup>4</sup> Gunther, iii.; Otho Freisingen, ii. 20.

Frederick received the Imperial crown from the hands of the Pope to ratify his unlimited sovereignty over the contumacious cities of Lombardy. Arnold of Brescia had struck boldly at both powers; he utterly annulled the temporal supremacy of the Pope; and if he acknowledged, reduced the sovereignty of the Emperor to a barren title.<sup>1</sup> To a man so merciless Seizure and execution of and contemptuous of human life as Barba-  
rossa, the sacrifice of a turbulent demagogue, guilty of treason alike to the temporal and spiritual power, was a light thing indeed. Arnold had fled from Rome, doubtful and irresolute as to his future course; his splendid dreams had vanished, the faithless soil had crumbled under his feet. In Otricoli he had met Gerhard, Cardinal of St. Nicolas, who took him prisoner. He had been rescued by some one of the viscounts of Campania, his partisans, perhaps nobles, who held papal estates by grants from the republic. By them he was honored as a prophet.<sup>2</sup> Frederick sent his officers, who seized one of these Campanian nobles and compelled the surrender of Arnold: he was carried to Rome, committed to the custody of Peter, prefect of the city, who held for the Pope the castle of St. Angelo. No time was to be lost. He had been, even till within a short time, an object of passionate attachment to the people; there might be an insurrection of the people for his rescue. If he were reserved for the arrival of

<sup>1</sup> " Nil juris in hac re  
Pontifici summo, *modicum* concedere regi  
Suadebat populo: sic læsâ stultus utrâque.  
Majestate, reum geminæ se præbuit aulæ."

*Gunther*, iii. 383.

<sup>2</sup> "Tanquam prophetam in terrâ suâ cum omni honore habebant." —  
*Acta Hadriani in Cod. Vaticano apud Baronium.*

Frederick at Rome, what change might be wrought by his eloquence before the Imperial tribunal, by the offers of his republican friends, by the uncertain policy of Frederick, who might then consider the demagogue an useful control upon the Pope! The Church took upon itself the summary condemnation, the execution, of the excommunicated rebel. The execution was despatched with such haste, perhaps secrecy, that even at the time various rumors as to the mode and place of punishment were spread abroad. In one point alone all are agreed, that Arnold's ashes, lest the foolish people should worship the martyr of their liberties, were cast into the Tiber.<sup>1</sup> The Church had been wont to call in the tem-

<sup>1</sup> Sismondi, whom Von Raumer has servilely followed, gives a dramatic description of the execution before the Porta del Popolo; of Arnold looking down all the three streets which converge from that gate; of the sleeping people awakened by the tumult of the execution, and the glare of the flames from the pile on which his remains were burned, rising too late to the rescue, and gathering the ashes as relics. All this is pure fiction: neither the Cardinal of Arragon, nor Otho of Freisingen, nor Gunther, nor the wretched verses of Godfrey of Viterbo, have one word of it. Gunther and Otho of Freisingen affix him to a cross, and burn him.

*"Judicio cleri nostro sub principe victus,  
Adpensusque cruci, flammæque cremante solutus  
In cineres, Tiberine, tuas est sparsus in undas.  
Ne stolidæ plebis, quem fecerat, improbus error,  
Martyris ossa novo cineresve foveret honore."*

*Gunther.*

Anselm of Gemblours and Godfrey of Viterbo say that he was hanged. Gunther may mean by his crux a simple gallows: "Strangulat hunc laqueus, ignis et unda vehunt." But the most remarkable account is that of Gerohus de Investigatione Antichristi (on Gerohus see Fabricius, Bibliotheca Lat. Med. Ætat. iii. p. 47): "Arnoldus pro doctrinâ suâ non solum ab ecclesiâ Dei anathematis mucrone separatus insuper etiam suspendio neci traditus atque in Tyberim projectus est, ne videlicet Romanus populus, quem suâ doctrinâ illexerat, sibi eum martyrem dedicaret. Quem ego vellem pro tali doctrinâ suâ, quamvis pravâ, vel exilio, vel carcere, aut aliâ penâ præter mortem punitum esse, vel saltem taliter occisum, ut Romana Ecclesia seu curia ejus necis questione careret." The whole remark-



poral sword to shed the blood of man ; the capital punishment of Arnold was, by the judgment of the clergy, executed by the officer of the Pope ; even some devout churchmen shuddered when they could not deny that the blood of Arnold of Brescia was on the Church.

The sacrifice of human life had been offered ; but the treaty which it was to seal between the Emperor and the Pope was delayed by mutual suspicion. Their embassies had led to misunderstanding and jealousy. Hadrian was alarmed at the haughty tone, the hasty movements of Frederick ; he could not be ignorant that at the news of his advance to Rome the republicans had rallied and sent proposals to the Emperor ; he could not but conjecture the daring nature of those propositions. He would not trust himself in the power of Frederick ; as the German advanced towards Rome Hadrian continued to retire. The deputation from the Roman republic encountered Barbarossa on the Roman side of Sutri. Their lofty language showed how deeply and completely they were intox-<sup>Romans meet Frederick.</sup>icated with the doctrines of Arnold of Brescia : they seemed fondly to hope that they should find in Frederick a more powerful Arnold ; that by some scanty concessions of title and honor they should hardly yield up their independence upon the Empire and secure entirely their independence of the Pope.<sup>1</sup> They congratulated Frederick on his arrival in the neighborhood of Rome, if he came in peace, and with the intent to deliver them forever from the degrading yoke of the clergy. They ascribed all the old Roman glory, the

able passage in Franke *Arnold von Brescia*, p. 193, and Nicolini's *Notes*, p. 375.

<sup>1</sup> *Otho Freisingen*, ii. 22. *Gunther*, iii. 450.

conquest of the world, to the senate of Rome, of whom they were the representatives; they intimated that it was condescension on their part to bestow the imperial crown on a Transalpine stranger — “that which is ours of right we grant to thee;” they commanded him to respect their ancient institutions and laws, to protect them against barbarian violence, to pay five thousand pounds of silver to their officers as a largess for their acclamations in the Capitol, to maintain the republic even by bloodshed, to confirm their privileges by a solemn oath and by the Imperial signature. Frederick suppressed for a time his kingly, contemptuous indignation. He condescended in a long harangue to relate the transference of the Roman Empire to Charlemagne and his descendants. At its close he turned fiercely round. “Look at my Teutonic nobles, my banded chivalry. These are the patricians, these are the true Romans: this is the senate invested in perpetual authority. To what laws do you presume to appeal but those which I shall be pleased to enact? Your only liberty is to render allegiance to your sovereign.”

The crest-fallen republicans withdrew in brooding indignation and wounded pride to the city. It was now the turn of Hadrian to ascertain what reception  
*June 9.* he would meet with from the Emperor. From Nepi Hadrian rode to the camp of Frederick in the territory of Sutri. He was met with courteous respect by some of the German nobles, and escorted towards the royal tent. But he waited in vain for the Emperor to come forth and hold his stirrup as he alighted from his horse.<sup>1</sup> The affrighted cardinals turned back, and did not rest till they reached Civita Castellana. The

<sup>1</sup> *Otho Freisingen*, ii. 21. *Helmold*, i. 80.

Pope remained with a few attendants and dismounted : then came forth Frederick, bowed to kiss his feet, and offered himself to receive the kiss of peace. The intrepid Pope refused to comply till the king should have shown every mark of respect usual from former emperors to his predecessors : he withdrew from before the tent. The dispute lasted the whole following day. Frederick at last allowed himself to be persuaded by the precedents alleged, and went to Nepi, where the Pope had pitched his camp. The Emperor dismounted, held the stirrup of Hadrian, and assisted him to alight.<sup>1</sup> Their common interests soon led at least to outward amity. The coronation of Frederick as Em-<sup>June 11,</sup> peror by the Pope could not but give great <sup>1155.</sup> weight to his title in the estimation of Christendom, and Hadrian's unruly subjects could only be controlled by the strong hand of the Emperor. By the advice of Hadrian Frederick made a rapid march, <sup>June 18.</sup> took possession of the Leonine city and the church of St. Peter. The next day he was met on the steps of the church by the Pope, and received the <sup>Coronation of</sup> crown from his hands amid the acclamations <sup>the Emperor.</sup> of the army. The Romans on the other side of the Tiber were enraged beyond measure at their total exclusion from all assent or concern in the coronation. They had expected and demanded a great largess ; they had not even been admitted as spectators of the pompous ceremony. They met in the Capitol, crossed the bridge, endeavored to force their passage to St. Peter's, and slew a few of the miserable attendants whom they

<sup>1</sup> "Imperator — descendit eo viso de equo, et officium stratoris implevit et streugam ipsius tenuit, et tunc primo eum ad osculum dominus Papa recepit." — Cod. Ceneii. Carn. apud Muratori, Antiquit., M. A. i. 117.

found on their way. But Frederick was too watchful a soldier to be surprised : the Germans met them, slew 1000, took 200 prisoners, whom he released on the interposition of the Pope.<sup>1</sup>

But want of provisions compelled the Emperor to retire with the Pope to Tivoli ; there, each in their apparel of state, the Pope celebrated mass and gave the Holy Eucharist to the Emperor on St. Peter's day. The inhospitable climate began to make its usual ravages in the German army : Frederick, having achieved his object, after the capture and sacking of Spoleto, and some negotiations with the Byzantine ambassadors, retired beyond the Alps.<sup>2</sup>

Hadrian was thus, if abandoned by the protecting power, relieved from the importunate presence of the Emperor. The rebellious spirit of Rome seemed to have been crushed ; the temporal sovereignty restored to the Pope. He began again to bestow kingdoms, and by such gifts to bind to his interests the old allies of the pontificate more immediately at hand<sup>3</sup> — allies, if his Roman subjects should break out into insurrection, if less powerful, more submissive than the Imperialists. Hadrian had at first maintained, he now abandoned, the cause of the barons of Apulia, who were in arms against the King of Sicily. His first act had been to excommunicate that king :

Hadrian's alliance with King of Sicily.

<sup>1</sup> The Bishop is seized with a fit of martial enthusiasm, and expresses vividly the German contempt for the Romans. "*Cerneret nos tam immaniter quam audacter Romanos cædendo sternere, sternendo cædere, ac si dicerent, accipe nunc Roma pro auro Arabico Teutonicum ferrum. Hæc est pecunia quam tibi princeps tuus pro tuâ offert coronâ. Sic emitur a Francis Imperium.*" — Otho Freisingen, ii. 22.

<sup>2</sup> He was in Verona early in Sept. — Von Raumer, Reg., p. 531.

<sup>3</sup> At St. Germano (Oct. 1155) he had received the homage of Robert, Prince of Capua, and the other princes. — Cardin. Arragon. *loc. cit.*

now, at Benevento, William received from the hands of the Pope the investiture of the kingdom of Sicily, of the dukedom of Apulia, of the prin-<sup>June 9, 1156.</sup> cipalities of Capua, Naples, Salerno and Amalfi, and some other territories. William bound himself to fealty to the Pope, to protect him against all his enemies, to pay a certain tribute annually for Apulia and Calabria, and for the March.

The Emperor Frederick had aspired to be as absolute over the whole of Italy as of Germany. Hadrian had even entered into an alliance with him against Sicily; the invasion of that kingdom had only been postponed on account of the state of the Imperial army and the necessary retirement of the Emperor beyond the Alps. In this Sicilian alliance Frederick saw at once treachery, ingratitude, hostility.<sup>1</sup> It betrayed a leaning to Italian independence, the growth and confederation with Rome of a power inimical to his own. William of Sicily had overrun the whole kingdom of Apulia; it was again Italian: yet fully occupied by the affairs of Germany, the Emperor's only revenge was an absolute prohibition to all German Ecclesiastics to journey to Rome, to receive the confirmation of their ecclesiastical dignities, or on any other affairs. This measure wounded the pride of Rome; it did more, it impoverished her. It cut off a large part of that revenue which she drew from the whole of Christendom. The haughty jealousy betrayed by this arbitrary act was aggravated by a singular incident. Fred-<sup>Diet at Besançon.</sup> erick was holding a Diet of more than usual <sup>Oct. 24, 1157.</sup> magnificence at Besançon; he was there asserting his sovereignty over another of the kingdoms of Charle-

<sup>1</sup> Marangoni Chronic. Pisan. (Archivio Storico, vol. vi. p. 2), p. 16.



magne, that of Burgundy. From all parts of the world, from Rome, Apulia, Venice, Lombardy, France, England, and Spain, persons were assembled, either for curiosity or for traffic, to behold the pomp of the new Charlemagne, or to profit by the sumptuous expenditure of the Emperor and his superb magnates. The legates of the Pope, Roland the Chancellor Cardinal of St. Mark, and Bernard Cardinal of St. Clement, presented themselves; they were received with courtesy. The letters which they produced were read and interpreted by the Chancellor of the Empire. Even the opening address to the Emperor was heard with some astonishment. “The Pope and the cardinals of the Roman Church salute you; he as a father, they as brothers.” The imperious tone of the letter agreed with this beginning. It reproved the Emperor for his culpable negligence in not immediately punishing some of his subjects who had waylaid and imprisoned the Swedish Bishop of Lunden on his journey to Rome; it reminded Frederick of his favorable reception by the Pope in Italy, and that the Pope had bestowed on him the Imperial crown. “The Pope had not repented of his munificence nor would repent, even if he had bestowed greater favors.” The ambiguous word used for favors, “*beneficia*,” was taken in its feudal sense by the fierce and ignorant nobles. They supposed it meant that the Empire was held as a fief from the Pope. Those who had been at Rome remembered the arrogant lines which had been placed under the picture of the Emperor Lothair at the feet of the Pope, doing homage to him as his vassal.<sup>1</sup> Indignant mur-

<sup>1</sup> “*Rex venit ante fores, jurans prius urbis honores,  
Post homo fit Papæ, sumit quo dante coronam.*”

murs broke from the assembly ; the strife was exasperated by the words of the dauntless Cardinal Roland, "Of whom, then, does he hold the Empire but of our Lord the Pope?" The Count Palatine, Otho of Witlesbach, drew his sword to cut down the audacious ecclesiastic. The authority of Frederick with difficulty appeased the tumult and saved the lives of the legates. Frederick, in a public manifesto, appealed to the Empire against the insolent pretensions of the Pope.<sup>1</sup> He accused Hadrian of wantonly stirring up hostility between the Church and the Empire. His address asserted (no doubt to bind the Transalpine clergy to his cause) that blank billets had been found on the legates empowering them to despoil the churches of the Empire and to carry away their treasures, even their sacred vessels and crosses, to Rome.<sup>2</sup> He issued an edict prohibiting the clergy from all access to the apostolic see, and gave instructions that the frontiers should be carefully watched lest any of them should find their way to Rome. Hadrian published an address to the bishops of the Empire, bitterly complaining of the blasphemies uttered by the Chancellor Rainald and the Count Pala-

<sup>1</sup> Radevic. i. 8, 19. Gunther, vi. 800. Concil. sub ann. 1157.

"Jam non ferre crucem domini, sed tradere regna  
Gaudet, et Augustus mavult quam præsul haberi."

*Gunther.*

So taunted Frederick the ambition of the Pope.

<sup>2</sup> "Porro quia multa paria litterarum apud eos reperta sunt, et schedulæ sigillatæ ad arbitrium eorum adhuc scribendæ (sicut hactenus consuetudinis eorum fuit) per singulas ecclesias Teutonici regni conceptum iniquitatis suæ virus respergere, altaria denudare, vasa domûs Dei asportare, cruces excoriare nitebantur." This charge appears in the Rescript of Frederick 'n Radevicus. If untrue, it boldly calculated on as much ignorance in his clergy, as had been shown by the laity. But what was the ground of the charge? Some taxation, ordinary or extraordinary, of the clergy? — Radevic. Chron. apud Pistorium, i. 10.

tine against the legates, of the harsh proceedings of the Emperor, but without disclaiming the ambiguous sense of the offensive word; he claimed their loyal support for the successor of St. Peter and the holy Roman Church. But the bishops had now for the most part become German princes rather than papal churchmen. They boldly declared, or at least assented to the Emperor's declaration of the supremacy of the Empire over the Church, demanded that the offensive picture of Lothair doing homage to the Pope should be effaced, the insulting verses obliterated.<sup>1</sup> They even hinted their disapprobation of Hadrian's treaty with the King of Sicily, and in respectful but firm language entreated the Pope to assume a more gentle and becoming tone.

The triumphant progress of Frederick's ambassadors, Rainald the Chancellor of the Empire and Otho Palatine of Bavaria, through Northern Italy, with the formidable preparations for the Emperor's own descent during the next year, had no doubt more effect in bringing back the Pope to less unseemly conduct. In the camp at Augsburg appeared the new legates, the Cardinal of St. Nireus and Achillas, and the Cardinal Hyacinth (who had been seized, plundered, and imprisoned by some petty chieftains in the Tyrol). They had authority to explain away the doubtful terms, to disclaim all pretensions on the part of the Pope to consider the Empire a benefice of the Church, or to make a grant of the Empire. Frederick accepted the overtures, and an outward reconciliation took place.

The next year Frederick descended for the second time into Italy. Never had so powerful a Teutonic

<sup>1</sup> Radevic. ii. 31.

army, not even in his first campaign, crossed the Alps. The several roads were choked by the contingents from every part of the Empire ; all Germany seemed to be discharging itself upon the plains of Italy. The Dukes of Austria and Carinthia descended the pass of Friuli ; Duke Frederick of Swabia, the Emperor's nephew, by Chiavenna and the Lake of Como ; Duke Bernard of Zahringen by the Great St. Bernard ; the Emperor himself marched down the valley of Trent. July, 1158.

At first his successes and his cruelties carried all before him. He compelled the submission of Milan ; the haughty manner in which he asserted the Imperial rights, the vast army with which he enforced those rights, the merciless severity with which he visited all treasonable resistance, seemed to threaten the ruin of all which remained either of the temporal or spiritual independence of Italy.<sup>1</sup> He seemed determined, he avowed his determination, to rule the clergy like all the rest of his subjects ; to compel their homage for all their temporal possessions ; to exact all the Imperial dues, to be, in fact as well as in theory, their feudal sovereign. He enforced the award already made of the inheritance of the Countess Matilda to his uncle Guelf VI. of Bavaria.

Slight indications betrayed the growing jealousy and alienation of the Emperor and the Pope. <sup>Jealousy of Emperor and Pope.</sup> These two august sovereigns seemed to take delight in galling each other by petty insults, but each of these insults had a deeper significance.<sup>2</sup> Guido, of a noble German house, the Counts of Blandrada, was elected, if through the imperial interest yet according

<sup>1</sup> Radevic. i. 26. Gunther, vii. 220. Almost all the German chronicles.

<sup>2</sup> Radevic. ii. 15, 20. Gunther, ix. 115.

Nov. 24,  
1158.

to canonical forms, to the Archiepiscopate of Ravenna, once the rival, now next to Rome in wealth and state. Guido was subdeacon of the Roman Church, and Hadrian refused to permit the translation, under the courteous pretext that he could not part with so beloved a friend, whose promotion in the Church of Rome was his dearest object. Hadrian soon after sent a letter to the Emperor, couched in moderate language, but complaining with bland bitterness of disrespect shown to his legates; of the insolence of the imperial troops, who gathered forage in the Papal territories and insulted the castles of the Pope; of the exaction of the same homage from bishops and abbots as from the cities and nobles of Italy. This letter was sent by a common, it was said a ragged messenger, who disappeared without waiting for an answer. The Emperor revenged himself by placing his own name in his reply before

Letter of  
Hadrian.

that of the Pope, and by addressing him in the familiar singular instead of the respectful plural, a style which the Popes had assumed when addressing the Emperor, and which Frederick declared to be an usurpation on their part.<sup>1</sup> Hadrian's next let-

June 24.

ter showed how deep the wound had sunk. "The law of God promises long life to those who honor, threatens death to those who speak evil of their father and their mother. He that exalteth himself shall be abased. My son in the Lord (such is the endearing name which Hadrian uses to convict the Emperor of a breach of the divine commandment), we wonder at your irreverence. This mode of address incurs the guilt of insolence, if not of arrogance. What shall I say of the fealty sworn to St. Peter and

<sup>1</sup> Appendix ad Radev. 562.



to us ? How dost thou show it ? By demanding homage of bishops, who are Gods, and the Saints of the Most High ; thou that makest them place their consecrated hands in yours ! Thou that closest not merely the churches, but the cities of thy empire against our legates ! We warn thee to be prudent. If thou hast deserved to be consecrated and crowned by our hands, by seeking more than we have granted, thou mayest forfeit that which we have condescended to grant." This was not language to soften a temper like Frederick's : his rejoinder rises to scorn and defiance. He reminds the Pope of the humble relation of Answer of Frederick. A.D. 1159. Sylvester to Constantine ; all that the Popes possess is of the gracious liberality of the Emperors. He reverts to higher authority, and significantly alludes to the tribute paid by our Lord himself, through St. Peter, to Cæsar. "The churches are closed, the city gates will not open to the Cardinals, because they are not preachers, but robbers ; not peacemakers, but plunderers ; not the restorers of the world, but greedy rakers up of gold.<sup>1</sup> When we shall see them, as the Church enjoins, bringing peace, enlightening the land, maintaining the cause of the lowly in justice, we shall not hesitate to provide them with fitting entertainment and allowances." — "We cannot but return such answer when we find that detestable monster 'pride' to have crept up to the very chair of St. Peter. As ye are for peace, so may ye prosper."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Quod non videmus eos prædicatores sed prædatores, non pacis corroboratores sed pecuniæ raptore, non orbis reparatores sed auri insatiabiles corrasores." — Append. Radevic.

<sup>2</sup> "Non enim non possumus respondere auditis, cum superbiæ detestabilem bestiam usque ad sedem Petri reptasse videmus. Paci bene consulentes bene semper valete." — Apud Baronium, sub ann. 1159.

Some of the German bishops, especially Eberhard of Bamberg, endeavored to mediate and avert the threatened conflict. The Emperor consented to receive four Cardinals. They brought a pacific proposition, but accompanied with demands which amounted to hardly less than the unqualified surrender of the Imperial rights. I. The first involved the absolute dominion of the city of Rome. The Emperor was to send no officer to act in his name within the city without permission of the Pope; the whole magistracy of the city and all the royalties being the property of the Apostolic See. II. No forage was to be levied in the Papal territories, excepting on occasion of the Emperor's coronation. His armies were thus prohibited from crossing the Papal frontier. III. The Bishops of Italy were to swear allegiance, but not do homage to the Emperor. IV. The ambassadors of the Emperor were not to be lodged of right in the episcopal palaces. V. The possessions of the Church of Rome to be restored, the whole domains of the Countess Matilda, the territory from Acquapendente to Rome, the Duchy of Spoleto, and the islands of Corsica and Sardinia; the Emperor to pay tribute for Ferrara, Massa, Fico-  
Terms proposed by the Pope. loro.

Frederick commanded his temper: such grave matters, he said, required the advice of his wisest counselors; but on some points he would answer at once. He would require no homage of the bishops if they would give up the fiefs which they held of the Empire. If they chose to listen to the Pope when he demanded what they had to do with the Emperor, they must submit to the commands of the Emperor, or what had they to do with the estates of the Empire? He would not

require that his ambassadors should be lodged in the episcopal palaces when those palaces stood on their own lands ; if they stood on the lands of the Empire, they were imperial, not episcopal palaces. “ For the city of Rome, by the grace of God I am Emperor of Rome : if Rome be entirely withdrawn from my authority, the Empire is an idle name, the mockery of a title.” Nor were these the only subjects of altercation. The Emperor complained of the intrusion of the Papal Legates into the Empire without his permission, the abuse of appeals, the treaties of the Pope with the Greek Empire and with the King of Sicily ; above all, his clandestine dealings with the insurgents, now in arms in Lombardy. He significantly intimated that if he could not make terms with the Pope, he might with the Senate and people of Rome.

Peace became more hopeless. As a last resource, six Cardinals on the part of the Pope, and six German Bishops on that of the Emperor, were appointed to frame a treaty. But the Pope demanded the reëstablishment of the compact made with his predecessor Eugenius. The Imperial Bishops reproached the Pope with his own violation of that treaty by his alliance with the King of Sicily ; the Germans unanimously rejected the demands of the Pope : and now the Emperor received with favor a deputation Firmness of Hadrian. from the Senate and people of Rome. These ambassadors of the Republican party had watched, had been present at the rupture of the negotiations.<sup>1</sup> The Pope, with the embers of Arnold’s rebellion smouldering

<sup>1</sup> “ Præsentes ibidem fuere Romanorum civium legati, qui cum indignatione mirabantur super his quæ audierant.” — Epist. Eberhard Bamberg, ap. Radevicum, ii. 31.

under his feet ; with the Emperor at the head of all Germany, the prelates as well as the princes ; with no ally but the doubtful, often perfidious Norman ; stood unshaken, betrayed no misgivings. To the Emperor no reply from the Pope appears ; but to the Archbishops of Treves, Mentz, and Cologne, was sent, or had before been sent, an invective against the Emperor, almost unequalled in scorn, defiance, and unmeasured assertion of superiority. There is no odious name in the Old Testament — Rabshakeh, Achitophel — which is not applied to Frederick. “ Glory be to God in the highest, that ye are found tried and faithful (he seems to reckon on their disloyalty to Frederick), while these flies of Pharaoh, which swarmed up from the bottom of the abyss, and, driven about by the whirling winds while they strive to darken the sun, are turned to the dust of the earth.” He threatens the Emperor with a public excommunication : “ And take ye heed that ye be not involved in the sins of Jeroboam, who made Israel to sin ; and behold a worse than Jeroboam is here. Was not the Empire transferred by the Popes from the Greeks to the Teutons ? The King of the Teutons is not Emperor before he is consecrated by the Pope. Before his consecration he is but King ; after it Emperor and Augustus. From whence, then, the Empire but from us ? Remember what were these Teutonic Kings before Zacharias gave his benediction to Charles, the second of that name, who were drawn in a wagon by oxen, like philosophers !<sup>1</sup> Glorious kings, who dwelt, like the chiefs of synagogues, in these wagons, while the Mayor of the Palace administered the affairs of the Empire. Zacharias I. pro-

<sup>1</sup> “ Qui in carpento boum, sicut *philosophi* circumferebantur.”

moted Charles to the Empire, and gave him a name great above all names. . . . That which we have bestowed on the faithful German we may take away from the disloyal German. Behold it is in our power to grant to whom we will. For this reason are we placed above nations and kingdoms, that we may destroy and pluck up, build and plant. So great is the power of Peter, that whatsoever is done by us worthily and rightfully must be believed to be done by God!"<sup>1</sup>

Did the bold sagacity of Hadrian foresee the heroic resolution with which Milan and her confederate Lombard cities would many years afterwards, and after some dire reverses and long oppression, resist the power of Barbarossa? Did he calculate with prophetic foresight the strength of Lombard republican freedom? Did he anticipate the field of Legnano, when the whole force of the Teutonic Empire was broken before the carroccio of Milan? Already was the secret treaty framed with Milan, Brescia, and Crema. These cities bound themselves not to make peace with the Emperor without the consent of the Pope and his Catholic successor. Hadrian was preparing for the last act of defiance, the open declaration of war, the excommunication of the Emperor, which he was pledged to pro-

<sup>1</sup> Hahn. *Monumenta*, i. p. 122. The date is March 19, 1159, from the Lateran palace. The date may be wrong, yet the bull authentic. Jaffé, I must observe, rejects it as spurious. This invective is reprinted in Pertz from a MS. formerly belonging to the Abbey of Malmedy. It appears there as an answer to a letter of Archbishop Hillin of Treves (published before in Hontheim, *Hist. Trev.* i. 581). Possibly I may have misplaced it. — Pertz, *Archiv.* iv. pp. 428–434. Boehmer seems to receive it as authentic, but as belonging to a period in which Frederick Barbarossa actually contemplated throwing off the Roman supremacy. — Preface to *Regesta*, p. vii.



nounce after the signature of the treaty with the Republics, when his death put an end to this strange conflict, where each antagonist was allied with a republican party in the heart of his adversary's dominions. Sept. 1, 1159. Hadrian IV. died at Anagni: his remains were brought to Rome, and interred with the highest honors, and with the general respect if not the grief of the city, in the Church of St. Peter. Even the ambassadors of Frederick were present at the funeral. So ended the poor English scholar, at open war with perhaps the mightiest sovereign who had reigned in Transalpine Europe since Charlemagne.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Radev. apud Muratori, Pars ii. p. 83. John of Salisbury reports another very curious conversation which he held with Hadrian IV. during a visit of three months at Benevento. John spoke strongly on the venality of Rome, and urged the popular saying, that Rome was not the mother but the stepmother of the churches; the sale of justice, purchase of preferments, and other abuses. "Ipse Romanus Pontifex omnibus gravis et pæne intolerabilis est?" The Pope smiled: "And what do you think?" John spoke handsomely of some of the Roman clergy as inaccessible to bribery, acknowledged the difficulty of the Pope in dealing with his Roman subjects, "dum frenas alios, et tu gravius opprimeris." The Pope concluded with the old fable of the belly and members. — Polycraticus, vi. 24.

## CHAPTER VIII.

ALEXANDER III. — VICTOR IV. — THOMAS À BECKET

THE whole conclave must have had the determined courage of Hadrian to concur in the election of a Pope: a schism was inevitable; a schism <sup>Double election.</sup> now the natural defence of the Empire against the Papacy, as a rebellion in Germany or Italy was that of the Papacy against the Empire. On one side were the zealous churchmen, who would hazard all for the supremacy of the spiritual power, those who thought the Sicilian alliance the safer and more legitimate policy of the See of Rome: and in Rome itself a faction of nobles, headed by the Frangipani, who maintained the papal authority in the city. On the other side were those who were attached to, or who dreaded the power of Barbarossa; the republican, or Arnoldine party in Rome; a few perhaps who loved peace, and thought it the best wisdom of the church to conciliate the Emperor. The conflicting accounts of the proceedings in the conclave were made public, on one side by the Pope, on the other by the Cardinals of the opposite faction,<sup>1</sup> and compel the inevitable conclusion that the passions of each party had effaced either all perception, or all respect for truth. Alexander III. is more minute and particular in his appeal to universal Christendom

<sup>1</sup> Both of these documents are in Radevicus.

on the justice of his election. On the third day of debate fourteen of the Cardinals agreed in the choice of himself Roland, the Cardinal of St. Mark, the chancellor of the Apostolic See, one of those legates who had shown so much audacity, and confronted so much peril at the Diet at Besançon. The cope was brought forth in which he was to be invested. Conscious of his insufficiency for this great post, he struggled against it with the usual modest reluctance.<sup>1</sup> Three only of the Cardinals, Octavian of St. Cecilia, John of St. Martin, and Guido of Crema, Cardinal of St. Callisto, were of the adverse faction, in close league with the imperial ambassadors, Otho Count Palatine,<sup>2</sup> and Guido Count of Blandrada. Octavian, prompted it is said by that ambassador, cried aloud he must not be compelled, and plucked the cope from his shoulders. The two others, the Cardinals Guido and of St. Martin, declared Octavian Pope; but a Roman senator who was present (the conclave then was an open court), indignant at his violence, seized the cope, and snatched it from the hand of Octavian. But Octavian's party were prepared for such an accident. His chaplain had another cope ready, in which he was invested with such indecent haste that, as it was declared, by a manifest divine judgment, the front part appeared behind, the hinder part before. Upon this

<sup>1</sup> Qui propter religionem suam cepit se excusare secundum quod canones præcipiunt. The author of this B. Museum Chronicle adds that the partisans of Octavian had ready *venustissimum* pallium, p. 46. See on this Chronicle book x. ch. 4.

<sup>2</sup> This must have been the Otho who threatened to cut down the insolent Cardinal Roland at Besançon; Guido of Blandrada, the Emperor's favorite, whom Hadrian had refused to elevate to the archiepiscopate of Ravenna. — *Epistola Canonice* apud Radevic., Otho Morena, Raoul de Reb. Ges. Frederic, Tristan Calchi.

the assembly burst into derisive laughter. At that instant, the gates, which had been closed, were forcibly broken open, a hired soldiery rushed in with drawn swords, and surrounding Octavian carried him forth in state. Roland (Alexander III.) and the cardinals of his faction were glad to escape with their lives, but reached a stronghold fortified and garrisoned for their reception near St. Peter's,<sup>1</sup> and for nine days they lay concealed and in security from their enemies. Octavian, in the mean time, assumed the name of Victor IV.: he was acknowledged as lawful Pope by a great part of the senators and people. The Frangipani then rallied the adverse party; Alexander was rescued from his imprisonment or blockade.

On the other side, Victor, and the Cardinals of his faction, thus relate the proceedings of the election. The Cardinals, when they entered the conclave, solemnly pledged themselves to proceed with calm deliberation, to ascertain the opinion of each with grave impartiality, not to proceed to the election without the general assent of all. But in a secret synod held at Anagni, during the lifetime of Hadrian, the anti-imperialist Cardinals, who had urged the Pope to excommunicate Frederick, had taken an oath to elect one of their own party. This conspiracy was organized and maintained by the gold of William of Sicily. In direct infringement of the solemn compact, made before the commencement of the proceedings, they had suddenly by acclamation attempted to force the election of the Cardinal Roland. The division was of nine to fourteen; they acknowledge themselves to have been the minority in numbers, but of course a

<sup>1</sup> It was called the "*munitio ecclesiæ Sancti Petri*."

minority of the wisest and best. While thus the nine protested against the violation of the agreement that the election was to be by general assent, the fourteen proceeded to invest Roland of Sienna. The nine then, at the petition of the Roman people, by the election of the whole clergy, the assent of almost all the senators, and of all the captains, barons, and nobles, both within and without the city, invested Victor IV. with the insignia of the popedom.

Rome was no safe place for either Pope; each faction had its armed force, its wild and furious rabble. As Victor advanced to storm the stronghold near St. Peter's, occupied by his rival, he was hooted by the adverse mob: boys and women shouted and shrieked, called him by opprobrious names, "heretic, blasphemer!" sung opprobrious verses, taunted him with the name of Octavian, so infamous in the history of the Popes; a pasquinade was devised for the occasion in Latin verse.<sup>1</sup> On the eleventh day appeared Otho Frangipani and a party of the nobles, dispersed the forces of Victor, opened the gates of the stronghold, and led forth Alexander amid the acclamations of his partisans, but hurried him hastily away through the gates of the city.

<sup>1</sup> "Clamabant pueri contra ipsum ecclesiæ invasorem, dicentes, Maledicte, filii maledicti! dismanta, non eris Papa, non eris Papa! Alexandrum volumus, quem Deus elegit. Mulieres quoque blasphemantes ipsum hæreticum et eadem verba ingeminabant, et alia derisoria verba decantabant. Accedens autem Brito quidam audacter dixit hæc metricæ:

Quid facis insane, patriæ mors, Octaviane  
Cur præsumpsisti tunicam dividere Christi?  
Jam jam pulvis eris, modo vivis, cras morieris."

—Vit. ii. apud Muratori: S. R. I. iii. i. p. 419. Compare the *Acta Vaticana* apud Baronium. Victor is there called *Smanta* compagnum — I presume from the plucking the stole from the shoulders of Alexander.



Neither indeed of the rival Popes could venture on his consecration in Rome. Alexander was Sept. 24. clad in the papal mantle at a place called the Cistern of Nero;<sup>1</sup> consecrated by the Bishop of Ostia at Nimfa, towards the Apulian frontier; Victor by the Cardinal Bishop of Tusculum and the Bishops Oct. 4. of Nimfa and Ferentino, who had deserted the opposite party, in the monastery of Farsa.

The Emperor was besieging the city of Crema, when he received the intimation of this election Schism. from each of the rival Popes. He assumed the language of an impartial arbitrator: he summoned a council of all Christendom to meet at Pavia, and cited both the Popes to submit their claims to its decision. The summons to Alexander was addressed to the Cardinal Roland, the chancellor of the see of Rome.<sup>2</sup> Alexander refused to receive a mandate thus addressed, he protested against the right of the Emperor to summon a council without the permission of the Pope, nor would the Pope condescend to appear in the court of the Emperor to hear the sentence of an usurping tribunal. Victor, already sure of the favorable judgment,

<sup>1</sup> This was not lost on the Victorians; the Cistern of Nero was the place to which Nero had fled from the pursuing Romans; a fit place for people to hew themselves "cisterns which could not hold water." "Undecimo (die) exierunt (a Româ) et pervenerunt ad Cisternam Neronis in qua latuit Nero fugiens Romanos insequentes. Juste Cisternam adierunt, quia deliquerunt fontem aquæ vivæ, et *foderunt sibi* cisternas, cisternas dissipatas, quæ continere non valent aquas. Et ibi die altero qui duodecimus erat ab electione domini Victoris induerunt cancellariam stolam et pallium erroris, in destructionem et confusionem ecclesiæ, ibique primum cantaverunt; Te Deum laudamus." — Epist. Canon. St. Petri, apud Radevic. ii. 31. Each party avers of the other that he was *execratus*, not *consecratus*.

<sup>2</sup> According to the somewhat doubtful authority of John of Salisbury (Epist. 69), the Emperor's letter was addressed to Alexander as to Cardinal Roland, Chancellor of the Roman See, to Victor as Pontiff.

appeared with attestations of his lawful election from the Canons of St. Peter, and a great body of the clergy of Rome. The points which the party of Victor urged were, that Cardinal Roland had never been invested, according to his own admission, with the papal cope; the consent or rather the initiative of the whole clergy and people of Rome in the election of Octavian; the appearance of Roland after the election without the insignia of the Pope. The argument afterwards urged by the Emperor, was the disqualification of the Cardinals on account of their conspiracy, their premature election at Anagni during the lifetime of Hadrian. Neither Alexander, nor any one with authority to defend the cause of Alexander, appeared in the court. William of Pavia was silent.<sup>1</sup> The Council, after a grave debate and hearing of many witnesses (the Em-

Octave of the Epiphany, A.D. 1160. peror had withdrawn to leave at least seeming freedom to the ecclesiastics), with one accord declared Victor Pope, condemned and excommunicated the contumacious Cardinal of Sienna. To Victor the

Feb. 10. Emperor paid the customary honors, held his

Feb. 11. stirrup and kissed his feet.<sup>2</sup> Victor of course issued his excommunication of the Cardinal Roland. There was a secret cause behind, which no doubt strongly worked on the Emperor, through the Emperor on the council: letters of Alexander to the insurgent Lombard cities had been seized, and were in the hands of the Emperor.

<sup>1</sup> William of Pavia, Cardinal of St. Peter ad Vincula, was afterwards accused by the wrathful Becket of betraying his master at Pavia. — Thom. Epist. ii. 21.

<sup>2</sup> Muratori is provoked by this schism from his usual calmness. “Rendè poscia Federigo a questo idolo tutti gli onori, con tenergli la staffa, e bacciarli i *fetenti* piedi.” — Sub ann.

The Archbishop of Cologne set out for France, the Bishop of Mantua to England, the Bishop of Prague to Hungary, to announce the decision of the Council to Christendom, and to demand or persuade allegiance to Pope Victor.

Alexander did not shrink from the contest. At Anagni he issued his excommunication against March 24. the Emperor Frederick, the Antipope, and all his adherents.<sup>1</sup> He despatched his legates to all the kingdoms of Europe. His title was sooner or later acknowledged by France, Spain, England, Constantinople, Sicily, and Jerusalem, by the Cistercian and Carthusian monks. He struck a formidable blow against Frederick, now deeply involved in his mortal strife with the Lombard republic. His legate, the Cardinal John, found his way into Milan, and there in the presence and with the sanction of the martial Archbishop Uberto (the Archbishop had commanded on more than one occasion the cavalry of Milan), he published the excommunication of Octavian the Antipope, and Frederick the Emperor. A few days after, the same ban was pronounced against the Bishops of Mantua and Lodi and the consuls of all the cities in league with the Emperor.<sup>2</sup>

Thus the two Popes divided the allegiance of Christendom. France, Spain, England asserted Alexander. A council at Toulouse, representing France and England, had rejected the decision of the council of Pavia.<sup>3</sup> The Empire, Hungary, Bohemia, Norway, Sweden, submitted to Victor. Italy was divided: wherever the

<sup>1</sup> Radevic. ii. 22.

<sup>2</sup> Epist. Eberhardo Archep. Saltzburg, April 1.

<sup>3</sup> Pope Alexander, knowing his ground, condescended to appear by his representatives at this Council, though summoned by the kings of France and England.

authority of the Emperor prevailed, Victor was recognized as the successor of St. Peter; wherever it was opposed, Alexander. Sicily and Southern Italy were of Alexander's party. Each, Alexander at Anagni, Victor in Northern Italy, had uttered the last sentence of spiritual condemnation against his antagonist. From June 16-26. Anagni, knowing that Frederick dared not withdraw any strong force from the North of Italy, Alexander made a descent upon Rome, in order to add to the dignity of his cause by his possession of the capital city. He celebrated mass in the Lateran Church, and at Santa Maria Maggiore. But Rome, which would hardly endure the power of a Pope with undisputed authority, was no safe residence for one with a contested title. The turbulence of the people, the intrigues of the Antipope, the neighborhood of some of the Germans in the fortresses around (all the patrimony of St. Peter but Civita Vecchia, Anagni, and Terracina was in their power),<sup>1</sup> the uncertainty of support from Sicily, which was now threatened with civil war, the humiliation of Milan, induced him to seek refuge in France. Leaving a representative of his authority, Julius, the Cardinal of St. John, he embarked on board a Sicilian fleet: Villani, Archbishop of Imperialist Pisa, had met him at Terracina in his galley.<sup>2</sup> After some danger, touching at Leghorn, and Porto Venere, the Archbishop conveyed him to Piombino, and rendered him the highest honors: from thence he reached Genoa; and having remained there a short time, landed on the coast of France, near Montpellier.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Vit. Alexand. III.

<sup>2</sup> Marangoni, *Chronica Pisana*, p. 26.

<sup>3</sup> He disembarked near Montpellier, April, 1162; reëmbarked at the same place, September, 1165.

He was received everywhere with demonstrations of the utmost respect. There were some threatening appearances, a suspicious agreement, into which Louis had been betrayed, or had weakly consented to, that he would meet the Emperor Frederick at Lannes in Burgundy, each with his Pope, to decide the great controversy, or with the design of raising a third Pope; and there was an agreement which, neither being in earnest, each eluded with no great respect for veracity.<sup>1</sup> Yet, notwithstanding all this, the rival kings of France and England seemed to forget their differences to pay him honor. He was met by both at Courcy on the Loire; the two kings walked on either side of his horse, holding his bridle, and so conducted him into the town. There for above three years he dwelt, maintaining the state, and performing all the functions of a Pope in every part of Europe which acknowledged his sway. During his absence Frederick and Frederick's Pope seemed at first to be establishing their power beyond all chance of resistance throughout Italy. Milan fell,<sup>2</sup> and suffered the terrible vengeance of the Emperor; her walls were razed, her citizens dispersed. Sicily

Soon after  
Christmas,  
1161.

Feb. 9, 1162.

April 8.

March 26.

<sup>1</sup> The whole account of this affair, in which appears the consummate weakness of Louis of France, at his first interview the slave of Alexander, and the adroit pliancy mingled with firmness of Pope Alexander, is in the *Hist. Veziliensis* (apud Duchesne, and in Guizot's *Collection des Mémoires*, vol. vii.) compared with *Vit. Alexandri*, apud Muratori. See Renter, *Geschichte Alexander III.*, Berlin. The Protestant biographer is a thorough-going partisan of the subject of his biography — almost as much overawed as the convert Hurter by Innocent III. — and almost as high a Hildebrandine. He seems to me to estimate the character of Alexander, even from that point of view, much too highly.

<sup>2</sup> In the plunder of Milan the relics of the three kings fell to the share of the Archbishop of Cologne: that city has ever since boasted of the holy spoil. — *Otto de Sanct. Blas.* cxvi.



was a prey to civil factions, and it might seem to depend on the leisure or the caprice of Frederick, how soon he would subjugate the rest of Italy to his iron and absolute tyranny. But dark reverses were to come.

Death of  
Victor IV.  
April 20,  
1164.

Two years after the departure of Alexander to France, the Antipope Victor died at Lucca.

Paschal III.  
April 22.

Guido of Crema was chosen, it was said by one Cardinal only, but by a large body of Lombard clergy, and took the name of Paschal III.

At this period the whole mind of Christendom was drawn away and absorbed by a contest in a remoter province of the Christian world, which for a time obscured, at least among the more religious, and all who were enthralled to the popular and dominant religion (in truth, the larger part of Europe), both the wars of monarchy and republicanism in Northern Italy, and the strife of Pope and Antipope. Neither Alexander III. nor Paschal III. in their own day occupied to such an extent the thoughts of the clergy and the laity throughout Christendom; the church has scarcely a saint so speedily canonized after his death, so widely or so fervently worshipped, as Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury. Nor was it only the personal character of the antagonists, or the circumstances of the strife, it was the great principle involved, comprehending as it did the whole authority and sanctity of the sacerdotal order, which gave this commanding interest to the new war between the spiritual and temporal powers. It was in England that this war was waged; on its event depended to a great degree the maintenance of the hierarchy, as a separate and privileged caste of mankind, subject to

Thomas a  
Becket.

its own jurisdiction, and irresponsible but to its own superiors.

Our history, therefore, enters at length into this contest, not from pardonable nationality over-estimating its importance, but in the conviction that it is a chapter in the annals of Christianity indispensable to its completeness, general in its interest, and beyond almost all others characteristic of its age. Nor is it insulated from the common affairs of Latin Christendom. Throughout, the history of Becket is in the closest connection with that of Pope Alexander, and that of the Emperor Frederick and his Antipope. If not the fate of Becket, his support by Alexander III. depends on the variable fortunes of the Pope. While Alexander is in France (in which Henry of England had a wider dominion than the King of France), Becket is somewhat coldly urged to prudence and moderation. Still more when Alexander is returned to Italy. Then Becket's cause rises and falls with the Pope's prosperous or adverse fortunes : it depends on the predominance or the weakness of the Imperial power. The gold of England is the strength of Alexander. When Frederick is in the ascendant, and Henry threatens to withhold those supplies which maintain the Papal armies in the South, or the Papal interests in Milan and the Lombard cities ; or when Henry threatens to fall off to the Antipope ; Becket is wellnigh abandoned. Becket himself cannot disguise his indignation at the tergiversation of the Pope, the venality of the College of Cardinals. No sooner is Frederick's power on the wane ; no sooner has he suffered some of those fatal disasters which smote his authority, than Becket raises the song of

triumph. He knows that Pope Alexander will now dare to support him to the utmost.

The Norman conquest of England was as total a revolution in the Church of the island as in the civil government and social condition. The Anglo-Saxon clergy, since the days of Dunstan, had produced no remarkable man. The triumph of monasticism had enfeebled without sanctifying the secular clergy ; it had spread over the island all its superstition, its thralldom of the mind, its reckless prodigality of lands and riches to pious uses, without its vigor, its learning, its industrial civilization. Like its faithful disciple, its humble acolyte, its munificent patron, Edward the Confessor, it might conceal much gentle and amiable goodness ; but its outward character was that of timid and unworldly ignorance, unfit to rule, and exercising but feeble and unbeneficial influence over a population become at once more rude and fierce, and more oppressed and servile, by the Danish conquest. Its ignorance may have been exaggerated. Though it may have been true that hardly a priest from Trent to Thames understood Latin, that the services of the church, performed by men utterly unacquainted with the ecclesiastical language, must have lost all solemnity ; yet the Anglo-Saxons possessed a large store of vernacular Christian literature — poems, homilies, legends. They had begun to form an independent Teutonic Christianity. Equally wonderful was the multitude of their kings who had taken the cowl, or on their thrones lived a monastic life and remained masters of wealth only to bestow it on the poor and on monasteries. The multitude of saints (no town was without its saint)

was so numerous as to surpass all power of memory to retain them, and wanted writers to record them.<sup>1</sup>

The Normans were not only the foremost nation in arms, in personal strength, valor, enterprise, perseverance, and all the greater qualities of a military aristocracy: by a singular accident, it might be called, they possessed a seminary of the most learned and able churchmen. The martial, ambitious, unlearned Odo of Bayeux was no doubt the type of many of the Norman prelates; of some of those on whom the Conqueror, when he built up his great system of ecclesiastical feudalism in the conquered land, bestowed some of the great sees in England, of which he had dispossessed the defeated Saxons. But from the same monastery of Bec came in succession two Primates of the Norman Church in England, in learning, sanctity, and general ability not inferior to any bishops of their time in Christendom — Lanfranc and Anselm. Lanfranc, to whom the Church had looked up as the most powerful antagonist of Berengar; Anselm as the profound metaphysician, who was to retain as willing prisoners, within the pale of orthodoxy, those strong speculative minds which before, and afterwards during the days of Abélard, should venture into those dangerous regions.

The Abbey of Bec, as has been said, had been

<sup>1</sup> "De regibus dico qui pro amplitudine potestatis licenter indulgere voluptatibus possent; quorum quidam in patriâ, quidam Romæ, mutato habitu, cœleste lucrati sunt regnum, beatum nacti commercium: multi specie tenus, totâ vitâ mundum amplexi; ut thesauros egenis effunderent, monasteriis dividerent. Quid dicam de tot episcopis, heremitis, abbatibus. Nonne tota insula tantis reliquiis indigenarum fulgurat ut vix vicum aliquem prætereas, ubi novi sancti nomen non audias! quam multorum etiam periit memoria, pro scriptorum inopiâ." — Will. Malmes. p. 417, edit. Hist. Soc.

Abbey of  
Bec. founded by a rude Norman knight, Herluin, in one of those strange accesses of devotion which suddenly changed men of the most uncongenial minds and most adverse habits into models of the most austere and almost furious piety. Herluin was as ignorant as he was rude ; his followers, who soon gathered around him, scarcely less so. But the Monastery of Bec, before half a century had elapsed, was a seat of learning. Strangers who were wandering over Europe found that which was too often wanting in the richer and settled convents, seclusion and austerity. Such was the case with Lanfranc : in the Abbey of Bec there was rigor enough to satisfy the most intense craving after self-torture. But the courtly Italian scholar was not lost in the Norman monk. Lanfranc became at once a model of the severest austerity and the accomplished theologian, to whom Latin Christendom looked up as the champion of her vital doctrine. Lanfranc became Abbot of St. Stephen's at Caen.

The Norman conqueror found that, although he had subjugated the Anglo-Saxon thanes and Anglo-Saxon people, he had not subjugated the Anglo-Saxon clergy. Notwithstanding the Papal benediction of the conquest of England, the manner in which Alexander II. openly espoused the cause, and the greater Hildebrand treated the kindred mind of the Conqueror with respect shown to no other monarch in Christendom, there was long a stubborn inert resistance, which with so superstitious a people might anywhere burst out into insurrection. As he had seized and confiscated the estates of the thanes, so the Conqueror put into safer, into worthier hands, the great benefices of the Church. Lanfranc (there could be no wiser measure than to advance a



man so famous for piety and learning throughout Christendom) was summoned to assume the primacy, from which the Conqueror, of his own will, though not without Papal sanction, had degraded the Anglo-Saxon Stigand. Lanfranc resisted, not only from monastic aversion to state and secular pursuits, but from unwillingness to rule a barbarous people, of whose language he was ignorant. Lanfranc yielded: he came as a Norman; his first act was to impose penance on the Anglo-Saxon soldiers who had dared to oppose William at Hastings; even on the archers whose bolts had flown at random, and did slay or might have slain Norman knights.

The Primate consummated the work of William in ejecting the Anglo-Saxon bishops and clergy. William would even proscribe their Saints: names unknown, barbarous, which refused to harmonize with Latin, were ignominiously struck out of the calendar as unauthorized and intrusive. The Primate proceeded to the degradation of the holy Wulstan of Worcester. His crime was want of learning, ignorance of French, perhaps rather of Latin. Wulstan, the pride, the holy example of the Anglo-Saxon episcopate, appeared before the Synod: "From the first I knew my unworthiness. I was compelled to be a bishop: the clergy, the prelates, my master, by the authority of the Apostolic See, laid this burden on my shoulder." He advanced to the tomb of the Confessor; he laid down his crosier on the stone: "Master, to thee only I yield up my staff." He took his seat among the monks. The crosier remained imbedded in the stone; and this wonder, which might seem as if the Confessor approved the resignation, was interpreted the other way. Wul-

stan alone retained his see. The Anglo-Saxon secular clergy, notwithstanding the triumph of monasticism, the severe laws of Edgar, even of Canute, still clung to their right or usage of marriage. Lanfranc could disguise even to himself, as zeal against the married priests, his persecution of the Anglo-Saxon clergy.

A king so imperious as William, and a churchman so firm as Lanfranc, could hardly avoid collision. Though they scrupled not to despoil the Saxon prelates, the Church must suffer no spoliation. The estates of the See of Canterbury must pass whole and inviolable.

Odo of Bayeux. The uterine brother of the King (his mother's son by a second marriage), Odo the magnificent and able Bishop of Bayeux, his counsellor in peace, ever by his side in war, though he neither wore arms nor engaged in battle, had seized, as Count of Kent, twenty-five manors belonging to the Archiepiscopal See.<sup>1</sup> The Primate summoned the Bishop of Bayeux to public judgment on Penenden Heath; the award was in the Archbishop's favor. Still William honored Lanfranc: Lanfranc, in the King's absence in Normandy, was chief justiciary, vicegerent within the realm. Lanfranc respected William. When the Conqueror haughtily rejected the demand of Hildebrand himself for allegiance and subsidy, we hear no remonstrance from the Primate. The Primate refused to go to Rome at the summons of the Pope. William Rufus, while Lanfranc lived, in some degree restrained his covetous encroachments on the wealth of the Church. Lanfranc

<sup>1</sup> Odo of Bayeux, according to Malmesbury, had even higher aspirations; his wealth, like Wolsey's, was designed to buy the Papacy itself. "*In aggerendis thesauris mirus, tergiversari miræ astutiæ; pene Papatum Romanum absens a civibus mercatus fuerit: peras peregrinorum epistolis et nummis infarciens.*" — p. 457.

had the prudence not to provoke the ungovernable King. But for five years after the death of Lanfranc Rufus would have no Primate, whose importunate control he thus escaped, while at the same time he converted to his own uses, without remonstrance, or at least without resistance, the splendid revenue of the see. Nothing but the wrath of God, as he supposed, during an illness which threatened his life, compelled him to place the crosier in the hands of the meek and, as he hoped, unworldly Anselm. It required as much violence in the whole nation, to whom Anselm's fame and virtues were so well known, to compel Anselm to accept the primacy, as to induce the King to bestow it.

Anselm,  
Archbishop  
of Canter-  
bury.  
A.D. 1093.

But when Primate, Anselm, the monk, the philosopher, was as high, as impracticable a churchman as the boldest or the haughtiest. Anselm's was passive courage, Anselm's was gentle endurance; but as unyielding, as impregnable, as that of Lanfranc, even of Hildebrand himself. No one concession could be wrung from him of property, of right, or of immunity belonging to his Church. He was a man whom no humiliation could humble: privation, even pain, he bore not only with the patience but with the joy of a monk. He was exiled: he returned the same meek, unoffending, unimpassioned man. His chief or first quarrel with Rufus was as to which of the Popes England should acknowledge. The Norman Anselm had before his advancement acknowledged Urban. It ended in Urban being the Pope of England. Nor was it with the violent, rapacious Rufus alone that Anselm stood in this quiet, unconquerable oppugnancy; the more prudent and politic Henry I. is committed in the same

strife. It was now the question of Investitures. At Rome, during his first exile, Anselm was deeply impregnated with the Italian notions of Investiture, that "venomous source of all simony." But the Norman kings were as determined to assert their feudal supremacy as the Franconian or Hohenstaufen Emperors.

Anselm is again in Rome: the Pope Urban threatens to excommunicate the King of England; Anselm interferes; the King is not actually excommunicate, but the ban is on all his faithful counsellors. At length, after almost a life, at least almost an archiepiscopate, passed in this strife with the King, to whom in all other respects except as regards the property of the see and the rights of the Church, Anselm is the most loyal of subjects, the great dispute about Investitures comes to an end. The wise Henry I. has discovered that, by surrendering a barren ceremony, he may retain the substantial power. He consents to abandon the form of granting the ring and pastoral staff; he retains the homage, and that which was the real object of the strife, the power of appointing to the wealthy sees and abbacies of the realm. The Church has the honor of the triumph; has wrung away the seeming concession; and Anselm, who in his unworldly views had hardly perhaps comprehended the real point at issue, has the glory and the conscious pride of success.

But the splendid and opulent benefices of the Anglo-Norman Church were too rich prizes to be bestowed on accomplished scholars, profound theologians, holy monks: the bishops at the close of Henry's reign are barons rather than prelates, their palaces are castles, their retainers vassals in arms. The wars between Stephen and the Empress Matilda

Character  
of the  
Anglo-  
Norman  
hierarchy.

are episcopal at least as much as baronial wars. It is the brother of Stephen, Henry Bishop of Winchester, the legate of the Pope, who is the author of Stephen's advancement. The citizens of London proclaim him: the coronation is at Winchester. The feeble Archbishop Theobald, the one less worldly prelate, yields to the more commanding mind of the royal bishop. In the Council of Oxford it was openly declared that the right to elect the king was in the bishops.<sup>1</sup> The Bishop of Salisbury had two nephews, the Bishops of Lincoln and of Ely; one of his sons (his sons by his concubine, Maud of Ramsbury) was Chancellor,<sup>2</sup> one Treasurer. Until the allegiance of the Bishops to Stephen wavered, the title of Matilda was hardly dangerous to the King. Stephen arrested the Bishops of Salisbury and Lincoln at Oxford, compelled them to surrender their strong castles of Newark, Salisbury, Sherborne, and Malmesbury. The Bishop of Ely flew to arms, threw himself into Devizes; it was only the threat to hang up his nephew, which compelled him to capitulate.<sup>3</sup> It was a strange confusion. The whole of the bishops' castles, treasures, munitions of war, were seized into the King's hands; he held them in the most rigid and inexorable grasp;<sup>4</sup> yet at the same time Stephen did public penance for having dared to lay his impious hands on the "Christs of the Lord." The revolt of the Bishop of Ely was only the signal for the general war: Stephen was taken in the battle of Lincoln, his defeated army was under the walls of that city to chastise the Bishop.

<sup>1</sup> "Eorum majori parti cleri Angliæ, ad cujus jus potissimum spectat principem eligere, simulque ordinare." — p. 746.

<sup>2</sup> "Qui nepos esse et plusquam nepos ferebatur."

<sup>3</sup> *Gesta Stephani*, p. 50.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.* p. 51.



If Matilda's pride had not alienated Henry of Winchester, as her exactions did the citizens of London, she might have obtained at once full possession of the throne. It was in besieging the castle of the Bishop of Winchester in that city that Robert of Gloucester, the leader of her party, was attacked by the Londoners under the Bishop of Winchester in person, and was taken in his retreat to Bristol. The Archbishop Theobald, who had now espoused Matilda's cause, hardly escaped.

Such were the prelates of England just before the commencement of Henry II.'s reign: all, says a contemporary writer, or almost all, wearing arms, mingling in war, indulging in all the cruelties and exactions of war.<sup>1</sup> The lower clergy could hardly, with such examples, be otherwise than, too many of them, lawless and violent men. Yet the Church demanded for the property and persons of such prelates and such clergy an absolute, inviolable sanctity. The seizure of their palaces, though fortified and garrisoned, was an invasion of the property of the Church. The seizure, maltreatment, imprisonment, far more any sentence of the law in the King's Courts upon their persons was impiety, sacrilege.<sup>2</sup>

Such had been, not many years before, the state of the clergy in England, when broke out in England,

<sup>1</sup> "Ipsi nihilominus, ipsi episcopi, quod pudet quidem dicere, non tamen omnes, sed plurimi ex omnibus, ferro accincti, armis instructi, cum patriæ perversoribus superbissimis invecti equis, prædæ participes in milites bellicæ sorte interceptos vel pecuniosos quibuscunque occurrunt vinculis et cruciatibus exponere," &c. — *Gesta Steph.* p. 99.

<sup>2</sup> "Si episcopi tramitem justitiæ in aliquo transgredierentur non esse regis sed canonum judicium: sine publico et ecclesiastico concilio illos nulla possessione privari posse." — *Malmesb.* p. 719. The grant of these castles, when surrendered to laymen, was an invasion on Church property.

and was waged for so many years, the great strife for the maintenance of the sacerdotal order as a peculiar caste of mankind, for its sole jurisdiction and its irresponsibility. Every individual in that caste, to its lowest door-keeper, claimed an absolute immunity from capital punishment. The executioner in those ages sacrificed hundreds of common human lives to the terror of the law. The churchman alone, to the most menial of the clerical body, stood above such law. The churchman too was judge without appeal in all causes of privilege or of property, which he possessed or in which he claimed the right of possession.

This strife was to be carried on with all the animation and interest of a single combat, instead of the long and confused conflict of order against order. Nor was it complicated with any of those intricate relations of the imperial and the papal power (the Emperor claiming to be the representative of the Cæsars of Rome, the Popes not only to be successors of the chief of the apostles, but also temporal sovereigns of Rome), which had drawn out to such interminable length the contest between the pontiffs and the houses of Franconia and Hohenstaufen. The champion of the civil power was Henry II. of England, a sovereign, at his Henry II. accession, with the most extensive territories and least limited power, with vast command of wealth, above any monarch of his time ; a man of great ability, decision, and activity ; of ungovernable passions and intense pride, which did not prevent him from stooping to dissimulation, intrigue and subtle policy. On the other hand, the Churchman, a subject of that Becket. sovereign, not of noble birth, but advanced by the grace of the king to the highest secular power ; yet

when raised by his own transcendent capacity and by the same misjudging favor to the height of ecclesiastical dignity, sternly and at once rending asunder all ties of attachment and gratitude, sacrificing the unbounded power and influence which he might have retained if he had still condescended to be the favorite of the king; an exile, yet so formidable as to be received not as a fugitive, but at once as a most valuable ally and an object of profound reverence by the King of France, and by other foreign princes. For seven years Becket inflexibly maintains his ground against the king, and almost all the more powerful prelates of England, and some of Normandy. At times seemingly abandoned by the Pope himself, yet disdaining to yield, and rebuking even the Pope for his dastardly and temporizing policy, he at length extorts his restoration to his see from the reluctant monarch. His barbarous assassination gave a temporary, perhaps, but complete triumph to his cause. The king, though not actually implicated in the murder, cannot avert the universal indignation but by the most humiliating submission, absolute prostration before the sacerdotal power, and by public and ignominious penance. Becket was the martyr for the Church, and this not only in the first paroxysm of devotion, and not only with the clergy, whom the murder of a holy prelate threw entirely on his side, but with the whole people, to whom his boundless charities, his splendor, his sufferings, his exile, and the imposing austerity of his life, had rendered him an object of awe and of love. He was the Saint whom the Church hastened to canonize, was compared in language, to us awfully profane, in his own time that of natural veneration, to the Saviour himself. The wor-

ship of Becket — and in those days it would be difficult to discriminate between popular worship and absolute adoration — superseded, not in Canterbury alone, nor in England alone, that of the Son of God, and even of his Virgin Mother.

Popular poetry, after the sanctification of Becket, delighted in throwing the rich colors of *mar- Legend.* vel over his birth and parentage. It invented, or rather interwove with the pedigree of the martyr, one of those romantic traditions which grew out of the wild adventures of the crusades, and which occur in various forms in the ballads of all nations. That so great a saint should be the son of a gallant champion of the cross, and of a Saracen princess, was a fiction too attractive not to win general acceptance.<sup>1</sup> The father of Becket, so runs the legend, a gallant soldier, was a captive in the Holy Land, and inspired the daughter of his master with an ardent attachment. Through her means he made his escape; but the enamored princess could not endure life without him. She too fled and made her way to Europe. She had learned but two words of the Christian language, *London* and *Gilbert*. With these two magic sounds upon her lips she reached London; and as she wandered through the streets, constantly repeating the name of Gilbert, she was met by Becket's faithful servant. Becket, as a good Christian, seems to have entertained religious scruples as to the propriety of wedding the

<sup>1</sup> The early life of Becket has been mystified both by the imaginative tendencies of the age immediately following his own, and by the theorizing tendencies of modern history. I shall shock some readers by unscrupulously rejecting the tale of the Saracen princess; if ever there was an historic ballad, an unquestionable ballad; as well as the Saxon descent of Becket, as undeniably an historic fable.

faithful, but misbelieving, or, it might be, not sincerely believing maiden. The case was submitted to the highest authority, and argued before the Bishop of London. The issue was the baptism of the princess, by the name of Matilda (that of the empress queen), and their marriage in St. Paul's with the utmost publicity and splendor.

But of this wondrous tale, not one word had reached the ears of any of the seven or eight contemporary biographers of Becket, most of them his most intimate friends or his most faithful attendants.<sup>1</sup> It was neither known to John of Salisbury, his confidential adviser and correspondent, nor to Fitz-Stephen, an officer of his court in chancery, and dean of his chapel when archbishop, who was with him at Northampton, and at his death; nor to Herbert de Bosham, likewise one of his officers when chancellor, and his faithful attendant throughout his exile; nor to the monk of Pontigny,

<sup>1</sup> There are no less than seven full contemporary, or nearly contemporary, Lives of Becket, besides fragments, legends, and "Passions." Dr. Giles has reprinted, and in some respects enlarged, those works from the authority of MSS. I give them in the order of his volumes. I. *Vita Sancti Thomæ. Auctore Edward Grim.* II. *Auctore Roger de Pontiniaco.* III. *Auctore Willelmo Filio Stephani.* IV. *Auctoribus Joanne Decano Salisburiensi, et Alano Abbate Teuksburiensi.* V. *Auctore Willelmo Cantuariensi.* VI. *Auctore Anonymo Lambethiensi.* VII. *Auctore Herberto de Bosham.* Of these, Grim, Fitz-Stephen, and Herbert de Bosham were throughout his life in more or less close attendance on Becket. The learned John of Salisbury was his bosom friend and counsellor. Roger of Pontigny was his intimate associate and friend in that monastery. William was probably prior of Canterbury at the time of Becket's death. The sixth professes also to have been witness to the death of Becket. (He is called Lambethiensis by Dr. Giles, merely because the MS. is in the Lambeth Library.) Add to these the curious French poem, written five years after the murder of Becket, by Garnier of Pont S. Maxence, partly published in the Berlin Transactions, by the learned Immanuel Bekker. All these, it must be remembered, write of the man; the later monkish writers (though near the time, Hoveden, Gervase, Diceto, Brompton) of the Saint.



who waited upon him and enjoyed his most intimate confidence during his retreat in that convent; nor to Edward Grim, his standard-bearer, who, on his way from Clarendon, reproached him with his weakness, and having been constantly attached to his person, finally interposed his arm between his master and the first blow of the assassin. Nor were these ardent admirers of Becket silent from any severe aversion to the marvellous; they relate, with unsuspecting faith, dreams and prognostics which revealed to the mother the future greatness of her son, even his elevation to the see of Canterbury.<sup>1</sup>

To the Saxon descent of Becket, a theory in which, on the authority of an eloquent French writer,<sup>2</sup> modern history has seemed disposed to acquiesce, these biographers not merely give no support, but furnish direct contradiction. The lower people no doubt admired during his life, and worshipped after death, the blessed Thomas of Canterbury, and the people were mostly Saxon. But it was not as a Saxon, but as a Saint, that Becket was the object of unbounded popularity during his life, of idolatry after his death.

The father of Becket, according to the distinct words of one contemporary biographer, was a native of Rouen, his mother of Caen.<sup>3</sup> Gilbert was Parentage and education.

<sup>1</sup> Brompton is not the earliest writer who recorded this tale; he took it from the *Quadriologus* I., but of this the date is quite uncertain. The exact date of Brompton is unknown. See preface in Twysden. He goes down to the end of Richard II.

<sup>2</sup> Mons. Thierry, *Hist. des Normands*. Lord Lyttelton (*Life of Henry II.*) had before asserted the Saxon descent of Becket: perhaps he misled M. Thierry.

<sup>3</sup> The anonymous *Lambethiensis*, after stating that many Norman merchants were allured to London by the greater mercantile prosperity, proceeds: "*Ex horum numero fuit Gilbertus quidam cognomento Becket, patriâ Rotomagensis . . . habuit autem uxorem, nomine Roseam natione*

no knight-errant, but a sober merchant, tempted by commercial advantages to settle in London: his mother neither boasted of royal Saracenic blood, nor bore the royal name of Matilda; she was the daughter of an honest burgher of Caen. His Norman descent is still further confirmed by his claim of relationship, or connection at least, as of common Norman descent, with Archbishop Theobald.<sup>1</sup> The parents of Becket, he asserts himself, were merchants of unimpeached character, not of the lowest class. Gilbert Becket is said to have served the honorable office of sheriff, but his

Born

A.D. 1118.

fortune was injured by fires and other casualties.<sup>2</sup> The young Becket received his earliest education among the monks of Merton in Surrey, towards whom he cherished a fond attachment, and delighted to visit them in the days of his splendor. The dwelling of a respectable London merchant seems to have been a place where strangers of very different pursuits, who resorted to the metropolis of England, took up their lodging: and to Gilbert Becket's house came persons both disposed and qualified to cultivate in various ways the extraordinary talents displayed by the youth, who was singularly handsome, and of engaging manners.<sup>3</sup> A knight, whose name, Richard de Aquila, occurs with distinction in the annals of the time, one of his father's guests, delighted in initiating the gay and spirited boy in chivalrous exercises, and in the chase with hawk and hound. On a hawking adventure

*Cadomensem, genere burgensium quoque non disparem.*" — Apud Giles, ii. p. 73.

<sup>1</sup> See below.

<sup>2</sup> "Quod si ad generis mei radicem et progenitores meos intenderis, cives quidem fuerunt Londonienses, in medio concivium suorum habitantes sine querelâ, nec omnino infimi." — Epist. 130.

<sup>3</sup> Grim, p. 9. Pontiniae, p. 96.

the young Becket narrowly escaped being drowned in the Thames. At the same time, or soon after, he was inured to business by acting as clerk to a wealthy relative, Osborn Octuomini, and in the office of the Sheriff of London.<sup>1</sup> His accomplishments were completed by a short residence in Paris, the best school for the language spoken by the Norman nobility. To his father's house came likewise two learned civilians from Bologna, no doubt on some mission to the Archbishop of Canterbury. They were so captivated by young Becket, that they strongly recommended him to Archbishop Theobald, whom the father of Becket reminded of their common honorable descent from a knightly family near the town of Thiersy.<sup>2</sup> Becket was at once on the high road of advancement. His extraordinary abilities were cultivated by In the household of the Archbishop. the wise patronage, and employed in the service of the primate. Once he accompanied that prelate to Rome;<sup>3</sup> and on more than one other occasion visited that great centre of Christian affairs. He was permitted to reside for a certain time at each of the great schools for the study of the canon law, Bologna and Auxerre.<sup>4</sup> He was not, however, without enemies. Even in the court of Theobald began the jealous rivalry with Roger, afterwards Archbishop of York, then Archdeacon of Canterbury.<sup>5</sup> Twice the superior in-

<sup>1</sup> Grim, p. 8.

<sup>2</sup> "Eo familiaris, quod præfatus Gilbertus cum domino archipræsule de propinquitate et genere loquebatur: ut ille *ortu Normannus* et circa Thierici villam de equestri ordine natu vicinus." — Fitz-Stephen, 184. Thiersy or Thierchville.

<sup>3</sup> Roger de Pontigny, p. 100.

<sup>4</sup> Fitz-Stephen, p. 185.

<sup>5</sup> According to Fitz-Stephen, Thomas was less learned (minus literatus) than his rival, but of loftier character and morals. — P. 184.

fluence of the archdeacon obtained his dismissal from the service of Theobald; twice he was reinstated by the good offices of Walter, Bishop of Rochester. At length the elevation of Roger to the see of York left the field open to Becket. He was appointed to the vacant archdeaconry, the richest benefice, after the bishoprics, in England. From that time he ruled without rival in the favor of the aged Theobald. Preferments were heaped upon him by the lavish bounty of his patron.<sup>1</sup> During his exile he was reproached with his ingratitude to the king, who had raised him from poverty. "Poverty!" he rejoined; "even then I held the archdeaconry of Canterbury, the provostship of Beverley, a great many churches, and several prebends."<sup>2</sup> The trial and the triumph of Becket's precocious abilities was a negotiation of the utmost difficulty with the court of Rome. The first object was to obtain the legatine power for Archbishop Theobald; the second tended, more than almost all measures, to secure the throne of England to the house of Plantagenet. Archbishop Theobald, with his clergy, had inclined to the cause of Matilda and her son; they had refused to officiate at the coronation of Eustace, son of King Stephen. Becket not merely obtained from Eugenius III. the full papal approbation of this refusal, but a condemnation of Stephen (whose title had before been sanctioned by Eugenius himself) as a perjured usurper.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Plurimæ ecclesiæ, præbendæ nonnullæ." Among the livings were one in Kent, and St. Mary le Strand; among the prebends, two at London and Lincoln. The archdeaconry of Canterbury was worth 100 pounds of silver a-year.

<sup>2</sup> Epist. 130.

<sup>3</sup> Lord Lyttelton gives a full account of this transaction. — Book i. p. 213.

But on the accession of Henry II., the aged Archbishop began to tremble at his own work ; serious apprehensions arose as to the disposition of the young king towards the Church. His connection was but remote with the imperial family (though his mother had worn the imperial crown, and some imperial blood might flow in his veins) ; but the Empire was still the implacable adversary of the papal power. Even from his father he might have received an hereditary taint of hatred to the Church, for the Count of Anjou had on many occasions shown the utmost hostility to the Hierarchy, and had not scrupled to treat churchmen of the highest rank with unexampled cruelty. In proportion as it was important to retain a young sovereign of such vast dominions in allegiance to the Church, so was it alarming to look forward to his disobedience. The Archbishop was anxious to place near his person some one who might counteract this suspected perversity, and to prevent his young mind from being alienated from the clergy by fierce and lawless counsellors. He had discerned not merely unrivalled abilities, but with prophetic sagacity, his Archdeacon's lofty and devoted churchmanship. Through the recommendation of the primate, Becket was raised to the dignity of chancellor,<sup>1</sup> an office which made him

<sup>1</sup> This remarkable fact in Becket's history rests on the authority of his friend, John of Salisbury: "Erat enim in suspectu adolescentia regis et juvenum et pravorum hominum, quorum conciliis agi videbatur . . . insipientiam et malitiam formidabat . . . cancellarium procurabat in curiâ ordinari, cujus ope et operâ novi regis ne sæviret in ecclesiam, impetum cohiberet et consilii sui temperaret malitiam." — Apud Giles, p. 321. This is repeated in almost the same words by William of Canterbury, vol. ii. p. 2. Compare what may be read almost as the dying admonitions of Theobald to the king: "Suggerunt vobis filii sæculi hujus, ut ecclesiæ minuatis auctoritatem, ut vobis regni dignitas augeatur." He had before said, "Cui



the second civil power in the realm, inasmuch as his seal was necessary to countersign all royal mandates. Nor was it without great ecclesiastical influence, as in the chancellor was the appointment of all the royal chaplains, and the custody of vacant bishoprics, abba-cies, and benefices.<sup>1</sup>

But the Chancellor, who was yet, with all his great preferments, only in deacon's orders, might seem disdainfully to throw aside the habits, feelings, restraints of the churchman, and to aspire as to the plenitude of secular power, so to unprecedented secular magnificence.<sup>2</sup> Becket shone out in all the graces of an accomplished courtier, in the bearing and valor of a gallant knight; though at the same time he displayed the most consummate abilities for business, the promptitude, diligence, and prudence of a practised statesman. The beauty of his person, the affability of his manners, the extraordinary acuteness of his senses,<sup>3</sup> his activity in all chivalrous exercises, made him the chosen companion of the king in his constant diversions, in the chase and in the mimic war, in all but his debaucheries. The king would willingly have lured the Chancellor into this companionship likewise; but the silence of his bitterest enemies, in confirmation of his own solemn protestations, may be admitted as conclusive testimonies to his unimpeached morals.<sup>4</sup> The

deest gratia Ecclesiæ, tota creatrix Trinitas adversatur." — Apud Bouquet, xvi. p. 504. Also Roger de Pontigny, p. 101.

<sup>1</sup> Fitz-Stephen, p. 186. Compare on the office of chancellor Lord Campbell's Life of Becket.

<sup>2</sup> De Bosham, p. 17.

<sup>3</sup> See a curious passage on the singular sensitiveness of his hearing, and even of his smell. — Roger de Pontigny, p. 96.

<sup>4</sup> Roger de Pontigny, p. 104. His character by John of Salisbury is remarkable: "Erat supra modum captator auræ popularis . . . etsi superbus

power of Becket throughout the king's dominions equalled that of the king himself—he was king in all but name: the world, it was said, had never seen two friends so entirely of one mind.<sup>1</sup> The well-known anecdote best illustrates their intimate familiarity. As they rode through the streets of London on a bleak winter day they met a beggar in rags. “Would it not be charity,” said the king, “to give that fellow a cloak, and cover him from the cold?” Becket assented; on which the king plucked the rich furred mantle from the shoulders of the struggling Chancellor and threw it, to the amazement and admiration of the bystanders, no doubt to the secret envy of the courtiers at this proof of Becket's favor, to the shivering beggar.<sup>2</sup>

But it was in the graver affairs of the realm that Henry derived still greater advantage from the wisdom and the conduct of the Chancellor.<sup>3</sup> To Becket's counsels his admiring biographers attribute the pacification of the kingdom, the expulsion of the foreign mercenaries who during the civil wars of Stephen's reign had devastated the land and had settled down as conquerors, especially in Kent, the humiliation of the refractory barons and the demolition of their castles. The peace was so profound that merchants could travel everywhere in safety, and even the Jews collect their

*esset et vanus et interdum faciem prætendebat insipienter amantium et verba proferret, admirandus tamen et imitandus erat in corporis castitate.”*  
—P. 320. See an adventure related by William of Canterbury, p. 3.

<sup>1</sup> Grim, p. 12. Roger de Pontigny, p. 102. Fitz-Stephen, p. 192.

<sup>2</sup> Fitz-Stephen, p. 191. Fitz-Stephen is most full and particular on the chancellorship of Becket.

<sup>3</sup> It is not quite clear how soon after the accession of Henry the appointment of the chancellor took place. I should incline to the earlier date, A.D. 1155.

debts.<sup>1</sup> The magnificence of Becket redounded to the glory of his sovereign. In his ordinary life he was sumptuous beyond precedent; he kept an open table, where those who were not so fortunate as to secure a seat at the board had clean rushes strewn on the floor, on which they might repose, eat, and carouse at the Chancellor's expense. His household was on a scale vast even for that age of unbounded retainership, and the haughtiest Norman nobles were proud to see their sons brought up in the family of the merchant's son. In his embassy to Paris to demand the hand of the Princess Margaret for the king's infant son, Ambassador to Paris. A.D. 1160. described with such minute accuracy by Fitz-Stephen,<sup>2</sup> he outshone himself, yet might seem to have a loyal rather than a personal aim in this unrivalled pomp. The French crowded from all quarters to see the splendid procession pass, and exclaimed, "What must be the king, whose Chancellor can indulge in such enormous expenditure?"

Even in war the Chancellor had displayed not only the abilities of a general, but a personal prowess, which, though it found many precedents in those times, might appear somewhat incongruous in an ecclesiastic, who yet held all his clerical benefices. In the expedition made by King Henry to assert his right to the dominions of the Counts of Toulouse, Becket appeared at the head of seven hundred knights who did him service, and foremost in every adventurous exploit was the valiant Chancellor. Becket's bold counsel urged the immediate storming of the city, which would have been followed by the captivity of

War in  
Toulouse.

<sup>1</sup> Fitz-Stephen, p. 187.

<sup>2</sup> P. 196.

the King of France. Henry, in whose character impetuosity was strangely moulded up with irresolution, dared not risk this violation of feudal allegiance, the captivity of his suzerain. The event of the war showed the policy as well as the superior military judgment of the warlike Chancellor. At a period somewhat later, Becket, who was left to reduce certain castles which held out against his master, unhorsed in single combat and took prisoner a knight of great distinction, Engelran de Trie. He returned to Henry in Normandy at the head of 1200 knights and 4000 stipendiary horsemen, raised and maintained at his own charge. If indeed there were grave churchmen even in those days who were revolted by these achievements in an ecclesiastic (he was still only in deacon's orders), the sentiment was by no means universal, nor even dominant. With some his valor and military skill only excited more ardent admiration. One of his biographers bursts out into this extraordinary panegyric on the Archdeacon of Canterbury: "Who can recount the carnage, the desolation, which he made at the head of a strong body of soldiers? He attacked castles, razed towns and cities to the ground, burned down houses and farms without a touch of pity, and never showed the slightest mercy to any one who rose in insurrection against his master's authority."<sup>1</sup>

The services of Becket were not unrewarded; the love and gratitude of his sovereign showered honors and emoluments upon him. Among his grants were the wardenship of the Tower of London, the lordship of the castle of Berkhamstead and the honor of Eye, with the service of a hundred and forty knights. Yet

<sup>1</sup> Edward Grim, p. 12.

there must have been other and more prolific sources of his wealth, so lavishly displayed. Through Wealth of Becket. his hands as Chancellor passed almost all grants and royal favors. He was the guardian of all escheated baronies and of all vacant benefices. It is said in his praise that he did not permit the king, as was common, to prolong those vacancies for his own advantage, that they were filled up with as much speed as possible; but it should seem, by subsequent occurrences, that no very strict account was kept of the king's moneys spent by the Chancellor in the king's service and those expended by the Chancellor himself. This seems intimated by the care which he took to secure a general quittance from the chief justiciary of the realm before his elevation to the archbishopric.

But if in his personal habits and occupations Becket lost in some degree the churchman in the secular dignitary, was he mindful of the solemn trust imposed upon him by his patron the archbishop, and true to the interests of his order? Did he connive at, or at least did he not resist, any invasion on ecclesiastical immunities, or, as they were called, the liberties of the clergy? did he hold their property absolutely sacred? It is clear that he consented to levy the scutage, raised on the whole realm, on ecclesiastical as well as secular property. All that his friend John of Salisbury can allege in his defence is, that he bitterly repented of having been the minister of this iniquity.<sup>1</sup> "If with

<sup>1</sup> John of Salisbury denies that he sanctioned the rapacity of the king, and urges that he only yielded to necessity. Yet his exile was the just punishment of his guilt. "Tamen quia eum ministrum fuisse iniquitatis non ambigo, jure optimo taliter arbitror puniendum ut eo potissimum puniatur auctore, quem in talibus Deo bonorum omnium auctori præferebat. . . . Sed esto: nunc pœnitentiam agit, agnoscit et confitetur culpam pro ea, et



Saul he persecuted the Church, with Paul he is prepared to die for the Church." But probably the worst effect of this conduct as regards King Henry was the encouragement of his fatal delusion that, as archbishop, Becket would be as submissive to his wishes in the affairs of the Church as had been the pliant Chancellor. It was the last and crowning mark of the royal confidence that Becket was intrusted with the education of the young Prince Henry, the heir to all the dominions of the king.

Six years after the accession of Henry II. died Theobald Archbishop of Canterbury. On the char- April, 1161.  
acter of his successor depended the peace of the realm, especially if Henry, as no doubt he did, already entertained designs of limiting the exorbitant power of the Church. Becket, ever at his right hand, could not but occur to the mind of the king. Nothing in his habits of life or conduct could impair the hope that in him the loyal, the devoted, it might seem unscrupulous subject, would predominate over the rigid churchman. With such a prime minister, attached by former benefits, it might seem by the warmest personal love, still more by this last proof of boundless confidence, to his person, and as holding the united offices of Chancellor and Primate, ruling supreme both in Church and State, the king could dread no resistance, or if there were resistance, could subdue it without difficulty.

Rumor had already designated Becket as the future primate. A churchman, the Prior of Leicester, on a visit to Becket, who was ill at Rouen, pointing to his apparel, said, "Is this a dress for an Archbishop of

*si cum Saulo quandoque ecclesiam impugnavit, nunc, cum Paulo ponere paratus est animam suam.*" — Bouquet, p. 518.

Canterbury?" Becket himself had not disguised his hopes and fears. "There are three poor priests in England, any one of whose elevation to the see of Canterbury I should wish rather than my own. I know the very heart of the king; if I should be promoted, I must forfeit his favor or that of God."<sup>1</sup>

The king did not suddenly declare his intentions. The see was vacant for above a year,<sup>2</sup> and the administration of the revenues must have been in the department of the Chancellor. At length as Becket, who had received a commission to return to England on other affairs of moment, took leave of his sovereign at Falaise, Henry hastily informed him that those affairs were not the main object of his mission to England—it was for his election to the vacant archbishopric. Becket remonstrated, but in vain; he openly warned, it is said, his royal master that as Primate he must choose between the favor of God and that of the king—he must prefer that of God.<sup>3</sup> In those days the interests of the clergy and of God were held inseparable. Henry no doubt thought this but the decent resistance of an ambitious prelate. The advice of Henry of Pisa, the Papal Legate, overcame the faint

<sup>1</sup> Fitz-Stephen, p. 193.

<sup>2</sup> Theobald died April 18, 1161. Becket was ordained priest and consecrated on Whitsunday, 1162.

<sup>3</sup> Yet Theobald, according to John of Salisbury, designed Becket for his successor, —

" hunc (*i. e.* Becket Cancellarium) successurum sibi sperat et orat,  
Hic est carnificum qui jus cancellat iniquum,  
Quos habuit reges Anglia capta diu,  
Esse putans reges, quos est perpressa, tyrannos  
Plus veneratur eos, qui nocuere magis."

*Entheticus*, i. 1295.

Did Becket decide against the Norman laws by the Anglo-Saxon? Has any one guessed the meaning of the rest of John's verses on the Chancellor and his Court? I confess myself baffled.

and lingering scruples of Becket: he passed to England with the king's recommendation, mandate it might be called, for his election.

All which to the king would designate Becket as the future primate could not but excite the apprehensions of the more rigorous churchmen. The monks of Canterbury, with whom rested the formal election, alleged as an insuperable difficulty that Becket had never worn the monastic habit, as almost all his predecessors had done.<sup>1</sup> The suffragan bishops would no doubt secretly resist the advancement, over all their heads, of a man who, latterly at least, had been more of a soldier, a courtier, and a lay statesman. Nor could the prophetic sagacity of any but the wisest discern the latent churchmanship in the ambitious and inflexible heart of Becket. It is recorded on authority, which I do not believe doubtful as to its authenticity, but which is the impassioned statement of a declared enemy, that nothing but the arrival of the great justiciary, Richard de Luci, with the king's peremptory commands, and with personal menaces of proscription and exile against the more forward opponents, awed the refractory monks and prelates to submission.

At Whitsuntide, Thomas Becket received priest's orders, and was then consecrated Primate of England with great magnificence in the Abbey of Westminster. The see of London being vacant, the ceremony was performed by the once turbulent, now aged and peaceful, Henry of Winchester, the brother of King Stephen. One voice alone, that of Gilbert Foliot, Bishop of Hereford,<sup>2</sup> broke the apparent harmony by a bitter sar-

<sup>1</sup> Roger de Pontigny, p. 100.

<sup>2</sup> In the memorable letter of Gilbert Foliot. Dr. Lingard observes that

casm — “The king has wrought a miracle; he has turned a soldier and a layman into an archbishop.”

Gilbert  
Foliot.

Gilbert Foliot, from first to last the firm and unawed antagonist of Becket, is too important a personage to be passed lightly by.<sup>1</sup> This sally was attributed no doubt by some at the time, as it was the subject afterwards of many fierce taunts from Becket himself, and of lofty vindication by Foliot, to disappointed ambition, as though he himself aspired to the primacy. Nor was there an ecclesiastic in England who might entertain more just hopes of advancement. He was admitted to be a man of unimpeachable life, of austere habits, and great learning. He had been Abbot of Gloucester and then Bishop of Hereford. He was in correspondence with four successive Popes, Cœlestine II., Lucius II., Eugenius III., Alexander, and with a familiarity which implies a high estimation for ability and experience. He is interfering in matters remote from his diocese, and commending other bishops, Lincoln and Salisbury, to the favorable consideration of the Pontiff. All his letters reveal as imperious and

Mr. Berington has proved this letter to be spurious. I cannot see any force in Mr. Berington's arguments, and should certainly have paid more deference to Dr. Lingard himself if he had examined the question. It seems, moreover (if I rightly understand Dr. Giles, and I am not certain that I do), that it exists in more than one MS. of Foliot's letters. He has printed it as unquestioned; no very satisfactory proceeding in an editor. The conclusive argument for its authenticity with me is this: Who, after Becket's death and canonization, would have ventured or thought it worth while to forge such a letter? To whom was Foliot's memory so dear, or Becket's so hateful, as to reopen the whole strife about his election and his conduct? Besides, it seems clear that it is either a rejoinder to the long letter addressed by Becket to the clergy of England (Giles, iii. 170), or that letter is a rejoinder to Foliot's. Each is a violent party pamphlet against the other, and of great ability and labor.

<sup>1</sup> Foliot's nearest relatives, if not himself, were Scotch; one of them had forfeited his estate for fidelity to the King of Scotland. — Epist. ii. cclxxviii.

conscientious a churchman as Becket himself, and in Becket's position Foliot might have resisted the king as inflexibly.<sup>1</sup> He was, in short, a bold and stirring ecclesiastic, who did not scruple to wield, as he had done in several instances, that last terrible weapon of the clergy which burst on his own head, excommunication.<sup>2</sup> It may be added that, notwithstanding his sarcasm, there was no open breach between him and Becket. The primate acquiesced in, if he did not promote, the advancement of Foliot to the see of London;<sup>3</sup> and during that period letters of courtesy which borders on adulation were interchanged at least with apparent sincerity.<sup>4</sup>

The king had indeed wrought a greater miracle than himself intended, or than Foliot thought possible. Becket became at once not merely a decent prelate, but an austere and mortified monk: he seemed determined to make up for his want of ascetic qualifications; to crowd a whole life of monkhood into a few years.<sup>5</sup> Under his canonical dress he wore a monk's frock, hair-cloth next his skin; his studies, his devotions, were

<sup>1</sup> Read his letters before his elevation to the see of London.

<sup>2</sup> See, *e.g.*, Epist. cxxxi., in which he informs Archbishop Theobald that the Earl of Hereford held intercourse with William Beauchamp, excommunicated by the Primate. "Vilescit anathematis autoritas, nisi et communicantes excommunicatis corripit digna severitas." The Earl of Hereford must be placed under anathema.

<sup>3</sup> Lambeth. p. 91. The election of the Bishop of Hereford to London is confirmed by the Pope's permission to elect him (March 19) rogatu H. regis et Archiep. Cantuariensis. A letter from Pope Alexander on his promotion rebukes him for *fasting too severely*. — Epist. ccclix.

<sup>4</sup> Foliot, in a letter to Pope Alexander, maintains the superiority of Canterbury over York. — cxlix.

<sup>5</sup> See on the change in his habits, Lambeth. p. 84; also the strange story, in Grim, of a monk who declared himself commissioned by a preterhuman person of terrible countenance to warn the Chancellor not to dare to appear in the choir, as he had done, in a secular dress. — p. 16.



long, regular, rigid. At the mass he was frequently melted into passionate tears. In his outward demeanor, indeed, though he submitted to private flagellation, and the most severe macerations, Becket was still the stately prelate; his food, though scanty to abstemiousness, was, as his constitution required, more delicate; his charities were boundless. Archbishop Theobald had doubled the usual amount of the primate's alms, Becket again doubled that; and every night in privacy, no doubt more ostentatious than the most public exhibition, with his own hands he washed the feet of thirteen beggars. His table was still hospitable and sumptuous, but instead of knights and nobles, he admitted only learned clerks, and especially the regulars, whom he courted with the most obsequious deference. For the sprightly conversation of former times were read grave books in the Latin of the church.

But the change was not alone in his habits and mode of life. The King could not have reprovèd, he might have admired, the most punctilious regard for the decency and the dignity of the highest ecclesiastic in the realm. But the inflexible churchman began to betray himself in more unexpected acts. While still in France Henry was startled at receiving a peremptory resignation of the chancellorship, as inconsistent with the religious functions of the primate. This act was as it were a bill of divorce from all personal intimacy with the king, a dissolution of their old familiar and friendly intercourse. It was not merely that the holy and austere prelate withdrew from the unbecoming pleasures of the court, the chase, the banquet, the tournament, even the war; they were no more to meet at the council board, and the seat of judicature. It had been said

that Becket was co-sovereign with the king, he now appeared (and there were not wanting secret and invidious enemies to suggest, and to inflame the suspicion) a rival sovereign.<sup>1</sup> The king, when Becket met him on his landing at Southampton, did not attempt to conceal his dissatisfaction; his reception of his old friend was cold.

It were unjust to human nature to suppose that it did not cost Becket a violent struggle, a painful sacrifice, thus as it were to rend himself from the familiarity and friendship of his munificent benefactor. It was no doubt a severe sense of duty which crushed his natural affections, especially as vulgar ambition must have pointed out a more sure and safe way to power and fame. Such ambition would hardly have hesitated between the ruling all orders through the king, and the solitary and dangerous position of opposing so powerful a monarch to maintain the interests and secure the favor of one order alone.

Henry was now fully occupied with the affairs of Wales. Becket, with the royal sanction, obeyed the summons of Pope Alexander to the Council of Tours. Becket had passed through part of France at the head of an army of his own raising, and under his command; he had passed a second time as representing the king, he was yet to pass as an exile. At Tours, where Pope Alexander now held his court, and pre-  
Becket at  
Tours.  
 sided over his Council, Becket appeared at May 19, 1163.  
 the head of all the Bishops of England, except those

<sup>1</sup> Compare the letter of the politic Arnulf, Bishop of Lisieux: "Si enim favori divino favorem præferretis humanum, poteratis non solum cum summâ tranquillitate degere, sed ipso etiam magis quam olim, Principe conregnare." — Apud Bouquet, xvi. p. 229.

excused on account of age or infirmity. So great was his reputation, that the Pope sent out all the cardinals except those in attendance on his own person to escort the primate of England into the city. In the council at Tours not merely was the title of Alexander to the popedom avouched with perfect unanimity, but the rights and privileges of the clergy asserted with more than usual rigor and distinctness. Some canons, one especially which severely condemned all encroachments on the property of the Church, might seem framed almost with a view to the impending strife with England.

That strife, so impetuous might seem the combatants  
Beginning  
of strife. to join issue, broke out, during the next year,  
in all its violence. Both parties, if they did  
not commence, were prepared for aggression. The  
first occasion of public collision was a dispute concerning the customary payment of the ancient Danegelt, of two shillings on every hide of land, to the sheriffs of the several counties. The king determined to transfer this payment to his own exchequer: he summoned an assembly at Woodstock, and declared his intentions. All were mute but Becket; the archbishop opposed the enrolment of the decree, on the ground that the tax was voluntary, not of right. "By the eyes of God," said Henry, his usual oath, "it shall be enrolled!" "By the same eyes, by which you swear," replied the prelate, "it shall never be levied on my lands while I live!"<sup>1</sup> On Becket's part, almost the first act of his primacy was to vindicate all the rights,

<sup>1</sup> This strange scene is recorded by Roger de Pontigny, who received his information on all those circumstances from Becket himself, or from his followers. See also Grim, p. 22.

and to resume all the property which had been usurped, or which he asserted to have been usurped, from his see.<sup>1</sup> It was not likely that, in the turbulent times just gone by, there would have been rigid respect for the inviolability of sacred property. The title of the Church was held to be indefeasible. Whatever had once belonged to the Church might be recovered at any time ; and the ecclesiastical courts claimed the sole right of adjudication in such causes. The primate was thus at once plaintiff, judge, and carried into execution his own judgments. The lord of the manor of Eynsford in Kent, who held of the king, claimed the right of presentation to that benefice. Becket asserted the prerogative of the see of Canterbury. On the forcible ejection of his nominee by the lord, William of Eynsford, Becket proceeded at once to a sentence of excommunication, without regard to Eynsford's feudal superior the king. The primate next demanded the castle of Tunbridge from the head of the powerful family of De Clare ; though it had <sup>Claims of Becket.</sup> been held by De Clare, and it was asserted, received in exchange for a Norman castle, since the time of William the Conqueror. The attack on De Clare might seem a defiance of the whole feudal nobility ; a determination to despoil them of their conquests, or grants from the sovereign.

The king, on his side, wisely chose the strongest and more popular ground of the immunities of the clergy from all temporal jurisdiction. He appeared as guar-

<sup>1</sup> Becket had been compelled to give up the rich archdeaconry of Canterbury, which he seemed disposed to hold with the archbishopric. Geoffrey Ridel, who became archdeacon, was afterwards one of his most active enemies.

dian of the public morals, as administrator of equal justice to all his subjects, as protector of the peace of the realm. Crimes of great atrocity, it is said, of great frequency, crimes such as robbery and homicide, crimes for which secular persons were hanged by scores and without mercy, were committed almost with impunity, or with punishment altogether inadequate to the offence by the clergy; and the sacred name of clerk, exempted not only bishops, abbots, and priests, but those of the lowest ecclesiastical rank from the civil power. It was the inalienable right of the clerk to be tried only in the court of his bishop; and as that court could not award capital punishment, the utmost penalties were flagellation, imprisonment, and degradation. It was only after degradation, and for a second offence (for the clergy strenuously insisted on the injustice of a second trial for the same act),<sup>1</sup> that the meanest of the clerical body could be brought to the level of the most highborn layman. But to cede one tittle of these immunities, to surrender the sacred person of a clergyman, whatever his guilt, to the secular power, was treason to the sacerdotal order: it was giving up Christ (for the Redeemer was supposed actually to dwell in the clerk, though his hands might be stained with innocent blood) to be crucified by the heathen.<sup>2</sup> To mutilate the person of one in holy orders was directly contrary to the Scripture (for with

<sup>1</sup> The king was willing that the clerk guilty of murder or robbery should be degraded before he was hanged, but hanged he should be. The archbishop insisted that he should be safe "a lesione membrorum." Degradation was in itself so dreadful a punishment, that to hang also for the same crime was a double penalty. "If he returned to his vomit," after degradation, "he might be hanged." — Compare Grim, p. 30.

<sup>2</sup> "De novo judicatur Christus ante Pilatum præsidem." — De Bosham, p. 117.



convenient logic, while the clergy rejected the example of the Old Testament as to the equal liability of priest and Levite with the ordinary Jew to the sentence of the law, they alleged it on their own part as unanswerable). It was inconceivable, that hands which had but now made God should be tied behind the back, like those of a common malefactor, or that his neck should be wrung on a gibbet, before whom kings had but now bowed in reverential homage.<sup>1</sup>

The enormity of the evil is acknowledged by Becket's most ardent partisans.<sup>2</sup> The king had credible information laid before him that some of the clergy were absolute devils in guilt, that their wickedness could not be repressed by the ordinary means of justice, and were daily growing worse.

Becket himself had protected some notorious and heinous offenders. A clerk of the diocese of Worcester had debauched a maiden and murdered her father. Becket ordered the man to be kept in prison, and refused to surrender him to the king's justice.<sup>3</sup> Another in London, guilty of stealing a silver goblet, was

<sup>1</sup> De Bosham, p. 100.

<sup>2</sup> The fairness with which the question is stated by Herbert de Bosham, the follower, almost the worshipper of Becket, is remarkable. "*Arctabatur itaque rex, arctabatur et pontifex. Rex etenim populi sui pacem, sicut archipræsul cleri sui zelans libertatim, audiens sic et videns et ad multorum relationes et querimonias accipiens, per hujusmodi castigationes, talium clericorum immo verius caracterizatorum, dæmonum flagitia non reprimi vel potius indies per regnum deterius fieri.*" He proceeds to state at length the argument on both sides. Another biographer of Becket makes strong admissions of the crimes of the clergy: "*Sed et ordinatorum inordinati mores, inter regem et archiepiscopum auxere malitiam, qui solito abundantius per idem tempus apparebant publicis irretiti criminibus.*" — Edw. Grim. It was said that no less than 100 of the clergy were charged with homicide.

<sup>3</sup> This, according to Fitz-Stephen, was the first cause of quarrel with the king. p. 215.

claimed as only amenable to the ecclesiastical court. Philip de Brois, a canon of Bedford, had been guilty of homicide. The cause was tried in the bishop's court; he was condemned to pay a fine to the kindred of the slain man. Some time after, Fitz-Peter, the king's justiciary, whether from private enmity or offence, or dissatisfied with the ecclesiastical verdict, in the open court at Dunstable, called De Brois a murderer. De Brois broke out into angry and contumelious language against the judge. The insult to the justiciary was held to be insult to the king, who sought justice, where alone he could obtain it, in the bishop's court. Philip de Brois this time incurred a sentence, to our notions almost as disproportionate as that for his former offence. He was condemned to be publicly whipped, and degraded for two years from the honors and emoluments of his canonry. But to the king the verdict appeared far too lenient; the spiritual jurisdiction was accused as shielding the criminal from his due penalty.

Such were the questions on which Becket was prepared to confront and to wage war to the death with the king; and all this with a deliberate knowledge both of the power and the character of Henry, his power as undisputed sovereign of England and of Continental territories more extensive and flourishing than those of the king of France. These dominions included those of the Conqueror and his descendants, of the Counts of Anjou, and the great inheritance of his wife, Queen Eleanor, the old kingdom of Aquitaine; they reached from the borders of Flanders round to the foot of the Pyrenees. This almost unrivalled power could not but have worked with the

Character of  
the King.

strong natural passions of Henry to form the character drawn by a churchman of great ability, who would warn Becket as to the formidable adversary whom he had undertaken to oppose, — “You have to deal with one on whose policy the most distant sovereigns of Europe, on whose power his neighbors, on whose severity his subjects look with awe; whom constant successes and prosperous fortune have rendered so sensitive, that every act of disobedience is a personal outrage; whom it is as easy to provoke as difficult to appease; who encourages no rash offence by impunity, but whose vengeance is instant and summary. He will sometimes be softened by humility and patience, but will never submit to compulsion; everything must seem to be conceded by his own free will, nothing wrested from his weakness. He is more covetous of glory than of gain, a commendable quality in a prince, if virtue and truth, not the vanity and soft flattery of courtiers, awarded that glory. He is a great, indeed the greatest of kings, for he has no superior of whom he may stand in dread, no subject who dares to resist him. His natural ferocity has been subdued by no calamity from without; all who have been involved in any contest with him, have preferred the most precarious treaty to a trial of strength with one so preëminent in wealth, in the number of his forces, and the greatness of his puissance.”<sup>1</sup>

A king of this character would eagerly listen to suggestions of interested or flattering courtiers, that unless

<sup>1</sup> See throughout this epistle of Arnulf of Lisieux, Bouquet, p. 230. This same Arnulf was a crafty and double-dealing prelate. Grim and Roger de Pontigny say that he suggested to Henry the policy of making a party against Becket among the English bishops, while to Becket he plays the part of confidential counsellor. — Grim, p. 29. R. P., p. 119. Will. Canterb., p. 6. Compare on Arnulf, Epist. 346, v. 11, p. 189.

the Primate's power were limited, the authority of the king would be reduced to nothing. The succession to the throne would depend entirely on the clergy, and he himself would reign only so long as might seem good to the Archbishop. Nor were they the baser courtiers alone who feared and hated Becket. The nobles might tremble from the example of De Clare, with whose powerful house almost all the Norman baronage was allied, lest every royal grant should be called in question.<sup>1</sup> Even among the clergy Becket had bitter enemies; and though at first they appeared almost as jealous as the Primate for the privileges of their order, the most able soon espoused the cause of the King; those who secretly favored him were obliged to submit in silence.

The King, determined to bring these great questions to issue, summoned a Parliament at Westminster. He commenced the proceedings by enlarging on the abuses of the archidiaconal courts. The archdeacons kept the most watchful and inquisitorial superintendence over the laity, but every offence was easily commuted for a pecuniary fine, which fell to them. The King complained that they levied a revenue from the sins of the people equal to his own, yet that the public morals were only more deeply and irretrievably depraved. He then demanded that all clerks accused of heinous crimes should be immediately degraded and handed over to the officers of his justice, to be dealt with according to law; for their guilt, instead of deserving a lighter punishment, was doubly guilty: he demanded this in the name of equal justice and the

<sup>1</sup> These are the words which Fitz-Stephen places in the mouths of the king's courtiers.

peace of the realm. Becket insisted on delay till the next morning, in order that he might consult his suffragan bishops. This the King refused: the bishops withdrew to confer upon their answer. The bishops were disposed to yield, some doubtless impressed with the justice of the demand, some from fear of the King, some from a prudent conviction of the danger of provoking so powerful a monarch, and of involving the Church in a quarrel with Henry at the perilous time of a contest for the Papacy which distracted Europe. Becket inflexibly maintained the inviolability of the holy persons of the clergy.<sup>1</sup> The King then demanded whether they would observe the "customs of the realm." "Saving my order," replied the Archbishop. That order was still to be exempt from all jurisdiction but its own. So answered all the bishops except Hilary of Chichester, who made the declaration without reserve.<sup>2</sup> The King hastily broke up the assembly, and left London in a state of consternation, the people and the clergy agitated by conflicting anxieties. He immediately deprived Becket of the custody of the Royal Castles, which he still retained, and of the momentous charge, the education of his son. The bishops entreated Becket either to withdraw or to change the offensive word. At first he declared that if an angel from Heaven should counsel such weakness, he would hold him accursed. At length, however, he yielded, as Herbert de Bosham asserts, out of love for the king,<sup>3</sup> by another account at the persuasion of the Pope's Almoner, said to have been bribed by Eng-

<sup>1</sup> Herbert de Bosham, p. 109. Fitz-Stephen, p. 209, *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> "Dicens se observaturos regias consuetudines bonâ fide."

<sup>3</sup> Compare W. Canterb., p. 6.



lish gold.<sup>1</sup> He went to Oxford and made the concession.

The King, in order to ratify with the utmost solemnity the concession extorted from the bishops, and even from Becket himself, summoned a great council of the realm to Clarendon, a royal palace between three and four miles from Salisbury. The two archbishops and eleven bishops, between thirty and forty of the highest nobles, with numbers of inferior barons, were present. It was the King's object to settle beyond dispute the main points in contest between the Crown and the Church; to establish thus, with the consent of the whole nation, an English Constitution in Church and State. Becket, it is said, had been assured by some about the King that a mere assent would be demanded to vague and ambiguous, and therefore on occasion disputable customs. But when these customs, which had been collected and put in writing by the King's order, appeared in the form of precise and binding laws, drawn up with legal technicality by the Chief Justiciary, he saw his error, wavered, and endeavored to recede.<sup>2</sup> The King broke out into one of his ungovernable fits of passion. One or two of the bishops who were out of favor with the King and two knights Templars on their knees implored Becket to abandon his dangerous, fruitless, and ill-timed resistance. The Archbishop took the oath,

<sup>1</sup> Grim, p. 29.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Lingard supposes that Becket demanded that the customs should be reduced to writing. This seems quite contrary to his policy; and Edward Grim writes thus: "Nam domestici regis, dato consentiente consilio, securum fecerant archiepiscopum, quod *nunquam scriberentur leges*, nunquam illarum fieret recordatio, si eum verbo tantum in audientiâ procerum honorâsset," &c. — P. 31.

which had been already sworn to by all the lay barons. He was followed by the rest of the bishops, reluctantly according to one account, and compelled on one side by their dread of the lay barons, on the other by the example and authority of the Primate, according to Becket's biographers, eagerly and of their own accord.<sup>1</sup>

These famous constitutions were of course feudal in their form and spirit. But they aimed at the subjection of all the great prelates of the realm Constitutions of Clarendon. to the Crown to the same extent as the great barons. The new constitution of England made the bishops' fiefs to be granted according to the royal will, and subjected the whole of the clergy equally with the laity to the common laws of the land.<sup>2</sup> I. On the vacancy of every archbishopric, bishopric, abbey, or priory, the revenues came into the King's hands. He was to summon those who had the right of election, which was to take place in the King's Chapel, with his consent, and the counsel of nobles chosen by the King for this office. The prelate elect was immediately to do homage to the King as his liege lord, for life, limb, and worldly honors, excepting his order. The archbishops, bishops, and all beneficiaries, held their estates on the tenure of baronies, amenable to the King's justice, and bound to sit with the other barons in all pleas of the Crown, except in capital cases. No archbishop, bishop, or any other person could quit the realm without royal permission, or without taking an oath at the King's requisition, not to do any damage, either going, staying, or returning, to the King or the kingdom.

<sup>1</sup> See the letter of Gilbert Foliot, of which I do not doubt the authenticity.

<sup>2</sup> According to the Cottonian copy, published by Lord Lyttelton, Constitutions xii. xv. iv.

II. All clerks accused of any crime were to be summoned before the King's Courts. The King's justiciaries were to decide whether it was a case for civil or ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Those which belonged to the latter were to be removed to the Bishops' Court. If the clerk was found guilty or confessed his guilt, the Church could protect him no longer.<sup>1</sup>

III. All disputes concerning advowsons and presentations to benefices were to be decided in the King's Courts; and the King's consent was necessary for the appointment to any benefice within the King's domain.<sup>2</sup>

IV. No tenant in chief of the King, none of the officers of the King's household, could be excommunicated, nor his lands placed under interdict, until due information had been laid before the King; or, in his absence from the realm, before the great Justiciary, in order that he might determine in each case the respective rights of the civil and ecclesiastical courts.<sup>3</sup>

V. Appeals lay from the archdeacon to the bishop, from the bishop to the Archbishop. On failure of justice by the Archbishop, in the last resort to the King, who was to take care that justice was done in the Archbishop's Court; and no further appeal was to be made without the King's consent. This was manifestly and avowedly intended to limit appeals to Rome.

All these statutes, in number sixteen, were restrictions on the distinctive immunities of the clergy: one, and that unnoticed, was really an invasion of popular freedom; no son of a villein could be ordained without the consent of his lord.

<sup>1</sup> Constitution iii.

<sup>2</sup> Constitutions i. and ii.

<sup>3</sup> Constitution vii., somewhat limited and explained by x.

Some of these customs were of doubtful authenticity. On the main question, the exorbitant powers of the ecclesiastical courts and the immunity of the clergy from all other jurisdiction, there was an unrepealed statute of William the Conqueror. Before the Conquest the bishop sat with the alderman in the same court. The statute of William created a separate jurisdiction of great extent in the spiritual court. This was not done to aggrandize the Church, of which in some respects the Conqueror was jealous, but to elevate the importance of the great Norman prelates whom he had thrust into the English sees. It raised another class of powerful feudatories to support the foreign throne, bound to it by common interest as well as by the attachment of race. But at this time neither party took any notice of the ancient statute. The King's advisers of course avoided the dangerous question; Becket and the Churchmen (Becket himself declared that he was unlearned in the customs), standing on the divine and indefeasible right of the clergy, could hardly rest on a recent statute granted by the royal will, and therefore liable to be annulled by the same authority. The Customs, they averred, were of themselves illegal, as clashing with higher irrevocable laws.

To these Customs Becket had now sworn without reserve. Three copies were ordered to be made — one for the Archbishop of Canterbury, one for York, one to be laid up in the royal archives. To these the King demanded the further guarantee of the seal of the different parties. The Primate, whether already repenting of his assent, or under the vague impression that this was committing himself still further (for oaths might be absolved, seals could not be torn from public

documents), now obstinately refused to make any further concession. The refusal threw suspicion on the sincerity of his former act. The King, the other prelates, the nobles, all but Becket,<sup>1</sup> subscribed and sealed the Constitutions of Clarendon as the laws of England.

As the Primate rode from Winchester in profound silence, meditating on the acts of the council and on his own conduct, one of his attendants, who has himself related the conversation, endeavored to raise his spirits. "It is a fit punishment," said Becket, "for one who, not trained in the school of the Saviour, but in the King's court, a man of pride and vanity, from a follower of hawks and hounds, a patron of players, has dared to assume the care of so many souls."<sup>2</sup> De Bosham significantly reminded his master of St. Peter, his denial of the Lord, his subsequent repentance. On his return to Canterbury Becket imposed upon himself the severest mortification, and suspended himself from his function of offering the sacrifice on the altar. He April 1. wrote almost immediately to the Pope to seek counsel and absolution from his oath. He received both. The absolution restored all his vivacity.

But the King had likewise his emissaries with the Pope at Sens. He endeavored to obtain a legatine commission over the whole realm of England for Becket's enemy, Roger Archbishop of York, and a recommendation from the Pope to Becket to observe the "customs" of the realm. Two embassies were sent

<sup>1</sup> Herbert de Bosham. "*Caute quidam non de plano negat, sed differendum dicebat adhuc.*"

<sup>2</sup> "*Superbus et vanus, de pastore avium factus sum pastor ovium; dudum fautor histrionum et eorum sectator tot animarum pastor.*" — De Bosham, p. 126.



by the King for this end : first the Bishops of Lisieux and Poitiers ; then Geoffrey Ridel, Archdeacon of Canterbury (who afterwards appears so hostile to the Primate as to be called by him that archdevil, not archdeacon), and the subtle John of Oxford. The embarrassed Pope (throughout it must be remembered that there was a formidable Antipope), afraid at once of estranging Henry, and unwilling to abandon Becket, granted the legation to the Archbishop of York. To the Primate's great indignation, Roger had his cross borne before him in the Province of Canterbury. On Becket's angry remonstrance, the Pope, while on the one hand he enjoined on Becket the greatest caution and forbearance in the inevitable contest, assured him that he would never permit the see of Canterbury to be subject to any authority but his own.<sup>1</sup>

Becket secretly went down to his estate at Romney, near the sea-coast, in the hope of crossing the straits, and so finding refuge and maintaining his cause by his personal presence with the Pope. Stormy weather forced him to abandon his design. He then betook himself to the King at Woodstock. He was coldly

<sup>1</sup> Read the Epistles, apud Giles, v. iv. 1, 3, Bouquet, xvi. 210, to judge of the skilful steering and difficulties of the Pope. There is a very curious letter of an emissary of Becket, describing the death of the Antipope (he died at Lucca, April 21). The canons of San Frediano, in Lucca, refused to bury him, because he was already "buried in hell." The writer announces that the Emperor also was ill, that the Empress had miscarried, and that therefore all France adhered with greater devotion to Alexander; *and the Legatine commission to the Archbishop of York had expired without hope of recovery.* The writer ventures, however, to suggest to Becket to conduct himself with modesty; to seek rather than avoid intercourse with the king. — Apud Giles, iv. 240; Bouquet, p. 210. See also the letter of John, Bishop of Poitiers, who says of the Pope, "*Gravi redimit pœnitentiâ, illam qualem qualem quam Eboracensi (fecerit), concessionem.*" — Bouquet, p. 214.

received. The King at first dissembled his knowledge of the Primate's attempt to cross the sea, a direct violation of one of the constitutions; but on his departure he asked with bitter jocularly whether Becket had sought to leave the realm because England could not contain himself and the King.<sup>1</sup>

The tergiversation of Becket, and his attempt thus to violate one of the Constitutions of Clarendon, to which he had sworn, showed that he was not to be bound by oaths. No treaty could be made where one party claimed the power of retracting, and might at any time be released from his covenant. In the mind of Henry, whose will had never yet met resistance, the determination was confirmed, if he could not subdue the Prelate, to crush the refractory subject. Becket's enemies possessed the King's ear. Some of those enemies no doubt hated him for his former favor with the King, some dreaded lest the severity of so inflexible a prelate should curb their license, some held property belonging to or claimed by the Church, some to flatter the King, some in honest indignation at the duplicity of Becket, and in love of peace, but all concurred to inflame the resentment of Henry, and to attribute to Becket words and designs insulting to the King and disparaging to the royal authority. Becket, holding such notions as he did of Church power, would not be cautious in asserting it; and whatever he might utter in his pride would be imbittered rather than softened when repeated to the King.

Since the Council of Clarendon, Becket stood alone.

<sup>1</sup> I follow De Bosham. Fitz-Stephen says that he was repelled from the gates of the king's palace at Woodstock; and that he *afterwards* went to Romney to attempt to cross the sea.

All the higher clergy, the great prelates of the kingdom, were now either his open adversaries or were compelled to dissemble their favor towards him. Whether alienated, as some declared, by his pusillanimity at Clarendon, bribed by the gifts, or overawed by the power of the King, whether conscientiously convinced that in such times of schism and division it might be fatal to the interests of the Church to advance her loftiest pretensions, all, especially the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of London, Salisbury, and Chichester, were arrayed on the King's side. Becket himself attributed the chief guilt of his persecution to the bishops. "The King would have been quiet if they had not been so tamely subservient to his wishes."<sup>1</sup>

Before the close of the year Becket was cited to appear before a great council of the realm at Parliament at Northampton. Oct. 6, 1164. All England crowded to witness this final strife, it might be, between the royal and the ecclesiastical power. The Primate entered Northampton with only his own retinue; the King had passed the afternoon amusing himself with hawking in the pleasant meadows around. The Archbishop, on the following morning after mass, appeared in the King's chamber with a cheerful countenance. The King gave not, according to English custom, the kiss of peace.

The citation of the Primate before the King in council at Northampton was to answer a charge of withholding justice from John the Marshall employed in the king's exchequer, who claimed the estate of Pagaham from the see of Canterbury. Twice had Becket

<sup>1</sup> "Quievisset ille, si non acquievissent illi." — Becket, Epist. ii. p. 5. Compare the whole letter.

been summoned to appear in the king's court to answer for this denial of justice: once he had refused to appear, the second time he did not appear in person. Becket in vain alleged an informality in the original proceedings of John the Marshall.<sup>1</sup> The court, the bishops, as well as the barons, declared him guilty of contumacy; all his goods and chattels became, according to the legal phrase, at the king's mercy.<sup>2</sup> The fine was assessed at 500 pounds. Becket submitted, not without bitter irony: "This, then, is one of the new customs of Clarendon." But he protested against the unheard-of audacity that the bishops should presume to sit in judgment on their spiritual parent; it was a greater crime than to uncover their father's nakedness.<sup>3</sup> Sarcasms and protests passed alike without notice. But the bishops, all except Foliot, consented to become

Demands on Becket. sureties for this exorbitant fine. Demands rising one above another seemed framed for the purpose of reducing the Archbishop to the humiliating condition of a debtor to the King, entirely at his disposal. First 300 pounds were demanded as due from the castles of Eye and Berkhamstead. Becket pleaded that he had expended a much larger sum on the repairs of the castles: he found sureties likewise for this payment, the Earl of Gloucester, William of Eynsford, and another of "his men." The next day the demand was for 500 pounds lent by the King during the siege of Toulouse. Becket declared that this

<sup>1</sup> He had been sworn not on the Gospels, but on a *tropologium*, a book of church music.

<sup>2</sup> Goods and chattels at the king's mercy were redeemable at a customary fine: this fine, according to the customs of Kent, would have been larger than according to those of London. — Fitz-Stephen.

<sup>3</sup> "Minus fore malum verenda patris detecta deridere, quam patris ipsius personam judicare." — De Bosham, p. 135.

was a gift, not a loan ;<sup>1</sup> but the King denying the plea, judgment was again entered against Becket. At last came the overwhelming charge, an account of all the moneys received during his chancellorship from the vacant archbishopric and from other bishoprics and abbeys. The debt was calculated at the enormous sum of 44,000 marks. Becket was astounded at this unexpected claim. As chancellor, in all likelihood, he had kept no very strict account of what was expended in his own and in the royal service ; and the King seemed blind to this abuse of the royal right, by which so large a sum had accumulated by keeping open those benefices which ought to have been instantly filled. Becket, recovered from his first amazement, replied that he had not been cited to answer on such charge ; at another time he should be prepared to answer all just demands of the Crown. He now requested delay, in order to advise with his suffragans and the clergy. He withdrew ; but from that time no single baron visited the object of the royal disfavor. Becket assembled all the poor, even the beggars, who could be found, to fill his vacant board.

In his extreme exigency the Primate consulted separately first the bishops, then the abbots. Takes counsel with the bishops. Their advice was different according to their characters and their sentiments towards him. He had what might seem an unanswerable plea, a formal acquittance from the chief Justiciary De Luci, the King's representative, for all obligations incurred in his civil capacity before his consecration as archbishop.<sup>2</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> Fitz-Stephen states this demand at 500 marks, and a second 500 for which a bond had been given to a Jew.

<sup>2</sup> Neither party denied this acquittance given in the King's name by the



King, however, it was known, declared that he had given no such authority. Becket had the further excuse that all which he now possessed was the property of the Church, and could not be made liable for responsibilities incurred in a secular capacity. The bishops, however, were either convinced of the insufficiency or the inadmissibility of that plea. Henry of Winchester recommended an endeavor to purchase the King's pardon; he offered 2000 marks as his contribution. Others urged Becket to stand on his dignity, to defy the worst, under the shelter of his priesthood; no one would venture to lay hands on a holy prelate. Foliot and his party betrayed their object.<sup>1</sup> They exhorted him as the only way of averting the implacable wrath of the King at once to resign his see. "Would," said Hilary of Chichester, "you were no longer archbishop, but plain Thomas. Thou knowest the King better than we do; he has declared that thou and he cannot remain together in England, he as King, thou as Primate. Who will be bound for such an amount? Throw thyself on the King's mercy, or to the eternal disgrace of the Church thou wilt be arrested and imprisoned as a debtor to the Crown." The next day was Sunday; the Archbishop did not leave his lodg-

justiciary Richard de Luci. This, it should seem, unusual precaution, or at least this precaution taken with such unusual care, seems to imply some suspicion that, without it, the archbishop was liable to be called to account; an account which probably, from the splendid prodigality with which Becket had lavished the King's money and his own, it might be difficult or inconvenient to produce.

<sup>1</sup> In an account of this affair, written later, Becket accuses Foliot of aspiring to the primacy — "*et qui adspirabant ad fastigium ecclesiæ Cantuariensis, ut vulgo dicitur et creditur, in nostram perniciem, utinam minus ambitiosè, quam avidè.*" This could be none but Foliot. — *Epist. lxxv. p. 154.*

ings. On Monday the agitation of his spirits had brought on an attack of a disorder to which he was subject : he was permitted to repose. On the morrow he had determined on his conduct. At one time he had seriously meditated on a more humiliating course : he proposed to seek the royal presence barefooted with the cross in his hands, to throw himself at the King's feet, appealing to his old affection, and imploring him to restore peace to the Church. What had been the effect of such a step on the violent but not ungenerous heart of Henry ? But Becket yielded to haughtier counsels more congenial to his own intrepid character. He began by the significant act of celebrating, out of its due order, the service of St. Stephen, the first martyr. It contained passages of holy writ (as no doubt Henry was instantly informed) concerning "kings taking counsel against the godly." The mass concluded ; in all the majesty of his holy character, in his full pontifical habits, himself bearing the archiepiscopal cross, the primate rode to the King's residence, and dismounting entered the royal hall. The cross <sup>Becket in the King's hall.</sup> seemed, as it were, an uplifting of the banner of the Church, in defiance of that of the King, in the royal presence ;<sup>1</sup> or it might be in that awful imitation of the Saviour, at which no scruple was ever made by the bolder churchmen—it was the servant of Christ who himself bore his own cross. "What means this new fashion of the Archbishop bearing his own cross ?" said the Archdeacon of Lisieux. "A fool," said Foliot,

<sup>1</sup> "Tanquam in prælio Domini, signifer Domini, vexillum Domini erigens: illud etiam Domini non solum spiritualiter, sed et figuraliter implens. 'Si quis,' inquit, 'vult meus esse discipulus, abneget semet ipsum, tollat crucem suam et sequatur me.'" — De Bosham, p. 143. Compare the letter of the Bishops to the Pope. — Giles, iv. 256; Bouquet, 224.

“he always was and always will be.” They made room for him; he took his accustomed seat in the centre of the bishops. Foliot endeavored to persuade him to lay down the cross. “If the sword of the king and the cross of the archbishop were to come into conflict, which were the more fearful weapon?” Becket held the cross firmly, which Foliot and the Bishop of Hereford strove, but in vain, to wrest from his grasp.

The bishops were summoned into the King’s presence: Becket sat alone in the outer hall. The Archbishop of York, who, as Becket’s partisans asserted, designedly came later that he might appear to be of the King’s intimate council, swept through the hall with his cross borne before him. Like hostile spears cross confronted cross.<sup>1</sup>

During this interval De Bosham, the archbishop’s reader, who had reminded his master that he had been standard-bearer of the King of England, and was now the standard-bearer of the King of the Angels, put this question, “If they should lay their impious hands upon thee, art thou prepared to fulminate excommunication against them?” Fitz-Stephen, who sat at his feet, said in a loud clear voice, “That be far from thee; so did not the Apostles and Martyrs of God: they prayed for their persecutors and forgave them.” Some of his more attached followers burst into tears. “A little later,” says the faithful Fitz-Stephen of himself, “when one of the King’s ushers would not allow me to speak to

<sup>1</sup> “*Quasi pila minantia pilis,*” quotes Fitz-Stephen; “*Memento,*” said De Bosham, “*quondam te extitisse regis Anglorum signiferum inexpugnabilem, nunc vero si signifer regis Angelorum expugnaris, turpissimum.*” — p. 146.

the Archbishop, I made a sign to him and drew his attention to the Saviour on the cross."

The bishops admitted to the King's presence announced the appeal of the Archbishop to the Pope, and his inhibition to his suffragans to sit in judgment in a secular council on their metropolitan.<sup>1</sup> These were again direct infringements on two of the constitutions of Clarendon, sworn to by Becket in an oath still held valid by the King and his barons. The King appealed to the council. Some seized the occasion of boldly declaring to the King that he had brought this difficulty on himself by advancing a low-born man to such favor and dignity. All agreed <sup>Condemnation of</sup> that Becket was guilty of perjury and treason.<sup>2</sup> A kind of low acclamation followed which was heard in the outer room and made Becket's followers tremble. The King sent certain counts and barons to demand of Becket whether he, a liegeman of the King, and sworn to observe the constitutions of Clarendon, had lodged this appeal and pronounced this inhibition? The Archbishop replied with quiet intrepidity. In his long speech he did not hesitate for a word: he pleaded that he had not been cited to answer these charges; he alleged again the Justiciary's acquittance; he ended by solemnly renewing his inhibition and his appeal: "My person and my church I place under the protection of the sovereign Pontiff."

The barons of Normandy and England heard with wonder this defiance of the King. Some seemed awe-

<sup>1</sup> Dicebant enim episcopi, quod adhuc, ipsâ die, intra decem dies datæ sententiæ, eos ad dominum Papam appellaverat, et ne de cetero eum judicarent pro seculari querelâ, quæ de tempore ante archipræsulatum ei moveretur, auctoritate domini Papæ prohibuit." — Fitz-Stephen, p. 230.

<sup>2</sup> Herbert de Bosham, p. 146.

struck and were mute ; the more fierce and lawless could not restrain their indignation. "The Conqueror knew best how to deal with these turbulent churchmen. He seized his own brother, Odo Bishop of Bayeux, and chastised him for his rebellion ; he threw Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury, into a fetid dungeon. The Count of Anjou, the King's father, treated still worse the bishop elect of Seez and many of his clergy : he ordered them to be shamefully mutilated and derided their sufferings."

The King summoned the bishops, on their allegiance as barons, to join in the sentence against Becket. But the inhibition of their metropolitan had thrown them into embarrassment, and perhaps they felt that the offence of Becket, if not capital treason, bordered upon it. It might be a sentence of blood, in which no churchman might concur by his suffrage — they dreaded the breach of canonical obedience. They entered the hall where Becket sat alone. The gentler prelates, Robert of Lincoln and others, were moved to tears ; even Henry of Winchester advised the archbishop to make an unconditional surrender of his see. The more vehement Hilary of Chichester addressed him thus : "Lord Primate, we have just cause of complaint against you. Your inhibition has placed us between the hammer and the anvil : if we disobey it, we violate our canonical obedience ; if we obey, we infringe the constitutions of the realm and offend the King's majesty. Yourself were the first to subscribe the customs at Clarendon, you now compel us to break them. We appeal, by the King's grace, to our lord the Pope." Becket answered "I hear."

They returned to the King, and with difficulty ob-



tained an exemption from concurrence in the sentence ; they promised to join in a supplication to the Pope to depose Becket. The King permitted their appeal. Robert Earl of Leicester, a grave and aged nobleman, was commissioned to pronounce the sentence. Leicester had hardly begun when Becket sternly interrupted him. "Thy sentence ! son and Earl, hear me first ! The King was pleased to promote me against my will to the archbishopric of Canterbury. I was then declared free from all secular obligations. Ye are my children ; presume ye against law and reason to sit in judgment on your spiritual father ? I am to be judged only, under God, by the Pope. To him I appeal, before him I cite you, barons and my suffragans, to appear. Under the protection of the Catholic Church and the Apostolic See I depart !"<sup>1</sup> He rose and walked slowly down the hall. A deep murmur ran through the crowd. Some took up straws and threw them at him. One uttered the word "Traitor !" The old chivalrous spirit woke in the soul of Becket. "Were it not for my order, you should rue that word." But by other accounts he restrained not his language to this pardonable impropriety — he met scorn with scorn. One officer of the King's household he upbraided for having had a kinsman hanged. Anselm, the King's brother, he called "bastard and catamite." The door was locked, but fortunately the key was found. He passed out into the street, where he was received by the populace, to whom he had endeared himself by his charities, his austerities, perhaps by his

<sup>1</sup> De Bosham's account is, that notwithstanding the first interruption, Leicester reluctantly proceeded till he came to the word "perjured," on which Becket rose and spoke.

courageous opposition to the king and the nobles, amid loud acclamations. They pressed so closely around him for his blessing that he could scarcely guide his horse. He returned to the church of St. Andrew, placed his cross by the altar of the Virgin. "This was a fearful day," said Fitz-Stephen. "The day of judgment," he replied, "will be more fearful." After supper he sent the Bishops of Hereford, Worcester, and Rochester to the King to request permission to leave the kingdom: the King coldly deferred his answer till the morrow.

Becket and his friends no doubt thought his life in danger: he is said to have received some alarming warnings.<sup>1</sup> It is reported, on the other hand, that the King, apprehensive of the fierce zeal of his followers, issued a proclamation that no one should do harm to the archbishop or his people. It is more likely that the King, who must have known the peril of attempting the life of an archbishop, would have apprehended and committed him to prison. Becket expressed his intention to pass the night in the church: his bed was

Flight of  
Becket.  
Oct. 13. strewn before the altar. At midnight he rose, and with only two monks and a servant stole out of the northern gate, the only one which was not guarded. He carried with him only his archiepiscopal pall and his seal. The weather was wet and stormy, but the next morning they reached Lincoln, and lodged with a pious citizen — piety and admiration of Becket were the same thing. At Lincoln he took the disguise of a monk, dropped down the Witham to a hermitage in the fens belonging to the Cistercians of Sempringham; thence by cross-roads, and chiefly by

<sup>1</sup> De Bosham, p. 150.

night, he found his way to Estrey, about five miles from Deal, a manor belonging to Christ Church in Canterbury. He remained there a week. On All Souls Day he went on board a boat, just before morning, and by the evening reached the coast of Flanders. To avoid observation he landed on the open shore near Gravelines. His large, loose shoes made it difficult to wade through the sand without falling. He sat down in despair. After some delay was obtained for a prelate, accustomed to the prancing war-horse or stately cavalcade, a sorry nag without a saddle, and with a wisp of hay for a bridle. But he soon got weary and was fain to walk. He had many adventures by the way. He was once nearly betrayed by gazing with delight on a falcon upon a young squire's wrist: his fright punished him for this relapse into his secular vanities. The host of a small inn recognized him by his lofty look and the whiteness of his hands. At length he arrived at the monastery of Clair Marais, near St. Omer: he was there joined by Herbert de Bosham, who had been left behind to collect what money he could at Canterbury: he brought but 100 marks and some plate. While he was in this part of Flanders the Justiciary, Richard de Luci, passed through the town on his way to England. He tried in vain to persuade the archbishop to return with him: Becket suspected his friendly overtures, or had resolutely determined not to put himself again in the King's power.

In the first access of indignation at Becket's flight the King had sent orders for strict watch to be kept in the ports of the kingdom, especially Dover. The next measure was to preoccupy the minds of the Count of

Flanders, the King of France, and the Pope against his fugitive subject. Henry could not but foresee how formidable an ally the exile might become to his rivals and enemies, how dangerous to his extensive but ill-consolidated foreign dominions. He might know that Becket would act and be received as an independent potentate. The rank of his ambassadors implied the importance of their mission to France. They were the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of London, Exeter, Chichester, and Worcester, the Earl of Arundel, and three other distinguished nobles. The same day that Becket passed to Gravelines, they crossed from Dover to Calais.<sup>1</sup>

The Earl of Flanders, though with some cause of hostility to Becket, had offered him a refuge; yet perhaps was not distinctly informed or would not know that the exile was in his dominions.<sup>2</sup> He received the King's envoys with civility. The King of France was at Compiègne. The strongest passions in the feeble mind of Louis VII. were jealousy of Henry of England, and a servile bigotry to the Church, to which he seemed determined to compensate for the hostility and disobedience of his youth. Against Henry, personally, there were old causes of hatred rankling in his heart, not the less deep because they could not

<sup>1</sup> Foliot and the King's envoys crossed the same day. It is rather amusing that, though Becket crossed the same day in an open boat, and, as is incautiously betrayed by his friends, suffered much from the rough sea, the weather is described as in his case almost miraculously favorable, in the other as miraculously tempestuous. So that while Becket calmly glided over, Foliot in despair of his life threw off his cowl and cope.

<sup>2</sup> Compare, however, Roger of Pontigny. By his account, the Count of Flanders, a relative and partisan of Henry ("consanguineus et qui partes ejus fovebat"), would have arrested him. He escaped over the border by a trick. — Roger de Pontigny, p. 148.

be avowed. Henry of England was now the husband of Eleanor, who, after some years of marriage, had contemptuously divorced the King of France as a monk rather than a husband, had thrown herself in-<sup>From 1152 to 1164.</sup> to the arms of Henry and carried with her a dowry as large as half the kingdom of France. There had since been years either of fierce war, treacherous negotiations, or jealous and armed peace, between the rival sovereigns.

Louis had watched, and received regular accounts of the proceedings in England; his admiration of Becket for his lofty churchmanship and daring opposition to Henry was at its height, scarcely disguised. He had already in secret offered to receive Becket, not as a fugitive, but as the sharer in his kingdom. The ambassadors appeared before Louis and presented a letter urging the King of France not to admit within his dominions the traitor Thomas, late Archbishop of Canterbury. "Late Archbishop! and who has presumed to depose him? I am a king, like my brother<sup>Louis of France.</sup> of England; I should not dare to depose the meanest of my clergy. Is this the King's gratitude for the services of his Chancellor, to banish him from France, as he has done from England?"<sup>1</sup> Louis wrote a strong letter to the Pope, recommending to his favor the cause of Becket as his own.

The ambassadors passed onward to Sens, where resided the Pope Alexander III., himself an<sup>Ambassadors at Sens.</sup> exile, and opposing his spiritual power to the highest temporal authority, that of the Emperor and his subservient Antipope. Alexander was in a position of extraordinary difficulty: on the one side were grati-

<sup>1</sup> Giles, iv. 253; Bouquet, p. 217.



tude to King Henry for his firm support, and the fear of estranging so powerful a sovereign, on whose unrivalled wealth he reckoned as the main strength of his cause; on the other, the dread of offending the King of France, also his faithful partisan, in whose dominions he was a refugee, and the duty, the interest, the strong inclination to maintain every privilege of the hierarchy. To Henry Alexander almost owed his pontificate. His first and most faithful adherents had been Theobald the primate, the English Church, and Henry King of England; and when the weak Louis had entered into dangerous negotiations at Lannes with the Emperor; when at Dijon he had almost placed himself in the power of Frederick, and his voluntary or enforced defection had filled Alexander with dread, the advance of Henry of England with a powerful force to the neighborhood rescued the French king from his perilous position.<sup>1</sup> And now, though Victor the Antipope was dead, a successor, Guido of Crema, had been set up by the imperial party, and Frederick would lose no opportunity of gaining, if any serious quarrel should alienate him from Alexander, a monarch of such surpassing power. An envoy from England, John Cumin, was even now at the imperial court.<sup>2</sup>

Becket's messengers, before the reception of Henry's ambassadors by Pope Alexander, had been admitted to a private interview. The account of Becket's "fight with beasts" at Northampton, and a skilful parallel with St. Paul, had melted the heart of the Pontiff, as he no doubt thought himself suffering like persecutions, to a flood of tears. How in truth could a Pope

<sup>1</sup> See back, page 281.

<sup>2</sup> *Epist. Nuntii*; Giles, iv. 254; Bouquet, p. 217.

venture to abandon such a champion of what were called the liberties of the church? He had, in fact, throughout been in secret correspondence with Becket. Whenever letters could escape the jealous watchfulness of the King, they had passed between England and Sens.<sup>1</sup>

The ambassadors of Henry were received in state in the open consistory. Foliot of London began with his usual ability; his warmth at length betrayed him into the Scriptural citation, — “The wicked fleeth when no man pursueth.” “Forbear,” said the Pope. “I will forbear him,” answered Foliot. “It is for thine own sake, not for his, that I bid thee forbear.” The Pope’s severe manner silenced the Bishop of London. Hilary, Bishop of Chichester, who had overweening confidence in his own eloquence, began a long harangue; but at a fatal blunder in his Latin, the whole Italian court burst into laughter.<sup>2</sup> The discomfited orator tried in vain to proceed. The Archbishop of York spoke with prudent brevity. The Count of Arundel, more cautious or less learned, used his native Norman. His speech was mild, grave, and conciliatory, and therefore the most embarrassing to the Pontiff. Alexander consented to send his cardinal

The King's  
ambassadors  
at Sens.

<sup>1</sup> Becket writes from England to the Pope: “Quod petimus, summo silentio petimus occultari. Nihil enim nobis tutum est, quum omnia ferè referuntur ad regem, quæ nobis in conclavi vel in aurem dicuntur.” There is a significant clause at the end of this letter, which implies that the emissaries of the Church did not confine themselves to Church affairs: “De Wallensibus et Oweno, qui se principem nominat, *provideatis*, quia Dominus Rex super hoc maximè motus est et indignatus.” The Welsh were in arms against the King: this borders on high treason. — Apud Giles. iii. 1, Bouquet, 221.

<sup>2</sup> The word “oportuebat” was too bad for monkish, or rather for Roman, ears.

legates to England; but neither the arguments of Foliot, nor those of Arundel, who now rose to something like a menace of recourse to the Antipope, would induce him to invest them with full power. The Pope would intrust to none but to himself the prerogative of final judgment. Alexander mistrusted the venality of his cardinals, and Henry's subsequent dealing with some of them justified his mistrust.<sup>1</sup> He was himself inflexible to tempting offers. The envoys privately proposed to extend the payment of Peter's Pence to almost all classes, and to secure the tax in perpetuity to the see of Rome. The ambassadors retreated in haste; their commission had been limited to a few days. The bishops, so strong was the popular feeling in France for Becket, had entered Sens as retainers of the Earl of Arundel: they received intimation that certain lawless knights in the neighborhood had determined to waylay and plunder these enemies of the Church, and of the saintly Becket.

Far different was the progress of the exiled primate. From St. Bertin he was escorted by the abbot, and by the Bishop of Terouenne. He entered France; he was met, as he approached Soissons, by the King's brothers, the Archbishop of Rheims, and a long train of bishops, abbots, and dignitaries of the church; he entered Soissons at the head of 300 horsemen. The interview of Louis with Becket raised his admiration into passion. As the envoys of Henry passed on one side of the river, they saw the pomp in which the ally of the King of France, rather than the

Becket at  
Sens.

<sup>1</sup> According to Roger of Pontigny, there were some of them "*qui acceptâ a rege pecuniâ partes ejus fovebant*," particularly William of Pavia. — p. 153.

exile from England, was approaching Sens. The cardinals, whether from prudence, jealousy, or other motives, were cool in their reception of Becket. The Pope at once granted the honor of a public audience; he placed Becket on his right hand, and would not allow him to rise to speak. Becket, after a skilful account of his hard usage, spread out the parchment which contained the Constitutions of Clarendon. They were read; the whole Consistory exclaimed against the violation of ecclesiastical privileges. On further examination the Pope acknowledged that six of them were less evil than the rest; on the remaining ten he pronounced his unqualified condemnation. He rebuked the weakness of Becket in swearing to these articles, it is said, with the severity of a father, the tenderness of a mother.<sup>1</sup> He consoled him with the assurance that he had atoned by his sufferings and his patience for his brief infirmity. Becket pursued his advantage. The next day, by what might seem to some trustful magnanimity, to others, a skilful mode of getting rid of certain objections which had been raised concerning his election, he tendered the resignation of his archiepiscopate to the Pope. Some of the more politic, it was said, more venal cardinals, entreated the Pontiff to put an end at once to this dangerous quarrel by accepting the surrender.<sup>2</sup> But the Pontiff (his own judgment being supported among others by the Cardinal Hyacinth) restored to him the archiepiscopal ring, thus ratifying his primacy. He assured Becket of his protection, and committed him to the hospitable care of

<sup>1</sup> Herbert de Bosham.

<sup>2</sup> *Alani Vita* (p. 362); and *Alan's Life* rests mainly on the authority of John of Salisbury. Herbert de Bosham suppresses this.

the Abbot of Pontigny, a monastery about twelve leagues from Sens. "So long have you lived in ease and opulence, now learn the lessons of poverty from the poor."<sup>1</sup> Yet Alexander thought it prudent to inhibit any proceedings of Becket against the King till the following Easter.

Becket's emissaries had been present during the interview of Henry's ambassadors with the Pope. Henry, no doubt, received speedy intelligence of these proceedings with Becket. He was at Marlborough after a disastrous campaign in Wales.<sup>2</sup> He issued immediate orders to seize the revenues of the Archbishop, and promulgated a mandate to the bishops to sequester the estates of all the clergy who had followed him to France. He forbade public prayers for the Primate. In the exasperated state, especially of the monkish mind, prayers for Becket would easily slide into anathemas against the king. The payment of Peter's Pence<sup>3</sup> to the Pope was suspended. All correspondence with Becket was forbid-

Effect on  
King Henry.

Wrath of  
Henry.

<sup>1</sup> The Abbot of Pontigny was an ardent admirer of Becket. See letter of the Bishop of Poitiers, Bouquet, p. 214. Prayers were offered up throughout the struggle with Henry for Becket's success at Pontigny, Cîteaux, and Clairvaux. — Giles, iv. 255.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Lingard. Becket on this news exclaimed, as is said, "His wise men are become fools; the Lord hath sent among them a spirit of giddiness; they have made England to reel to and fro like a drunken man." — Vol. iii. p. 227. No doubt, he would have it supposed God's vengeance for his own wrongs.

<sup>3</sup> There are in Foliot's letters many curious circumstances about the collection and transmission of Peter's Pence. In Alexander's present state, notwithstanding the amity of the King of France, this source of revenue was no doubt important. — Epist. 149, 172, &c. Alexander wrote from Clermont to Foliot (June 8, 1165) to collect the tax, to do all in his power for the recall of Becket: to Henry, reprobating the Constitutions; to Becket, urging prudence and circumspection. This was later. The Pope was then on his way to Italy, where he might need Henry's gold.



den. But the resentment of Henry was not satisfied. He passed a sentence of banishment, and ordered at once to be driven from the kingdom all the primate's kinsmen, dependents, and friends. Four hundred persons, it is said, of both sexes, of every age, even infants at the breast were included (and it was the depth of winter) in this relentless edict. Every adult was to take an oath to proceed immediately to Becket, in order that his eyes might be shocked, and his heart wrung by the miseries which he had brought on his family and his friends. This order was as inhumanly executed, as inhumanly enacted.<sup>1</sup> It was intrusted to Randolph de Broc, a fierce soldier, the bitterest of Becket's personal enemies. It was as impolitic as cruel. The monasteries and convents of Flanders and of France were thrown open to the exiles with generous hospitality. Throughout both these countries was spread a multitude of persons appealing to the pity, to the indignation of all orders of the people, and so deepening the universal hatred of Henry. The enemy of the Church was self-convicted of equal enmity to all Christianity of heart.

In his seclusion at Pontigny Becket seemed determined to compensate by the sternest monastic discipline for that deficiency which had been Becket at Pontigny. alleged on his election to the archbishopric. He put on the coarse Cistercian dress. He lived on the hard and scanty Cistercian diet. Outwardly he still maintained something of his old magnificence and the splendor of his station. His establishment of horses and retainers was so costly, that his sober friend, John of Salisbury, remonstrated against the profuse expendi-

<sup>1</sup> Becket, Epist. 4, p. 7.

ture. Richer viands were indeed served on a table apart, ostensibly for Becket; but while he himself was content with the pulse and gruel of the monks, those meats and game were given away to the beggars. His devotions were long and secret, broken with perpetual groans. At night he rose from the bed strewn with rich coverings, as beseeming an archbishop, and summoned his chaplain to the work of flagellation. Not satisfied with this, he tore his flesh with his nails, and lay on the cold floor, with a stone for his pillow. His health suffered; wild dreams, so reports one of his attendants, haunted his broken slumbers, of cardinals plucking out his eyes, fierce assassins cleaving his tattered crown.<sup>1</sup> His studies were neither suited to calm his mind, nor to abase his hierarchical haughtiness. He devoted his time to the canon law, of which the False Decretals now formed an integral part: sacerdotal fraud justifying the loftiest sacerdotal presumption. John of Salisbury again interposed with friendly remonstrance. He urged him to withdraw from these undevotional inquiries; he recommended to him the works of a Pope of a different character, the *Morals* of Gregory the Great. He exhorted him to confer with holy men on books of spiritual improvement.

King Henry in the mean time took a loftier and more menacing tone towards the Pope. "It is Negotiations with the Emperor. an unheard-of thing that the court of Rome should support traitors against my sovereign authority; I have not deserved such treatment.<sup>2</sup> I am still more indignant that the justice is denied to me which is granted to the meanest clerk." In his wrath he made

<sup>1</sup> Edw. Grim.

<sup>2</sup> Bouquet, xvi. 256.

overtures to Reginald, Archbishop of Cologne, the maker, he might be called, of two Antipopes, and the minister of the Emperor, declaring that he had long sought an opportunity of falling off from Alexander, and his perfidious cardinals, who presumed to support against him the traitor Thomas, late Archbishop of Canterbury.

The Emperor met the advances of Henry with promptitude, which showed the importance he attached to the alliance. Reginald of Cologne was sent to England to propose a double alliance with the house of Swabia, of Frederick's son, and of Henry the Lion, with the two daughters of Henry Plantagenet. The Pope trembled at this threatened union between the houses of Swabia and England. At the great diet held at Wurtzburg, Frederick asserted the canonical election of Paschal III.,<sup>Diet at Wurtzburg, A.D. 1165, Whitsuntide.</sup> the new Antipope, and declared in the face of the empire and of all Christendom, that the powerful kingdom of England had now embraced his cause, and that the King of France stood alone in his support of Alexander.<sup>1</sup> In his public edict he declared to all Christendom that the oath of fidelity to Paschal, of denial of all future allegiance to Alexander, administered to all the great princes and prelates of the empire, had been taken by the ambassadors of King Henry, Richard of Ilchester, and John of Oxford.<sup>2</sup> Nor was this all. A

<sup>1</sup> The letters of John of Salisbury are full of allusions to the proceedings at Wurtzburg. — Bouquet, p. 524. John of Oxford is said to have denied the oath (p. 533); also Giles, iv. 264. He is from that time branded by John of Salisbury as an arch liar.

<sup>2</sup> John of Oxford was rewarded for this service by the deanery of Salisbury, vacant by the promotion of the dean to the bishopric of Bayeux. Joscelyn, Bishop of Salisbury, notwithstanding the papal prohibition that

solemn oath of abjuration of Pope Alexander was enacted, and to some extent enforced; it was to be taken by every male under twelve years old throughout the realm.<sup>1</sup> The King's officers compelled this act of obedience to the King, in villages, in castles, in cities.

If the ambassadors of Henry at Wurtzburg had full powers to transfer the allegiance of the King to the Antipope; if they took the oath unconditionally, and with no reserve in case Alexander should abandon the cause of Becket; if this oath of abjuration in England was generally administered; it is clear that Henry soon changed, or wavered at least in his policy. The alliance between the two houses came to nothing. Yet even after this he addressed another letter to Reginald, Archbishop of Cologne, declaring again his long cherished determination to abandon the cause of Alexander, the supporter of his enemy, the Archbishop of Canterbury. He demanded safe-conduct for an embassy to Rome, the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of London,

no election should take place in the absence of some of the canons, chose the safer course of obedience to the King's mandate. This act of Joscelin was deeply resented by Becket. John of Oxford's usurpation of the deanery was one of the causes assigned for his excommunication at Vezelay. See also, on the loyal but somewhat unscrupulous proceedings of John of Oxford, the letter (hereafter referred to) of Nicolas de Monte Rotomagensi. It describes the attempt of John of Oxford to prepossess the Empress Matilda against Becket. It likewise betrays again the double-dealing of the Bishop of Lisieux, outwardly for the King, secretly a partisan and adviser of Becket. On the whole, it shows the moderation and good sense of the empress, who disapproved of some of the Constitutions, and especially of their being written, but speaks strongly of the abuses in the Church. Nicolas admires her skillfulness in defending her son. — Giles, iv. 187. Bouquet, 226.

<sup>1</sup> "Præcepit enim publicè et *compulit* per vicos, per castella, per civitates ab homine sene usque ab puerum duodenum beati Petri successorem Alexandrum abjurare." William of Canterbury alone of Becket's biographers (Giles, ii. p. 19) asserts this, but it is unanswerably confirmed by Becket's Letter 78, iii. p. 192.

John of Oxford, De Luci, the Justiciary, peremptorily to require the Pope to annul all the acts of Thomas, and to command the observance of the Customs.<sup>1</sup> The success of Alexander in Italy, aversion in England to the abjuration of Alexander, some unaccounted jealousy with the Emperor, irresolution in Henry, which was part of his impetuous character, may have wrought this change.

The monk and severe student of Pontigny found rest neither in his austerities nor his studies.<sup>2</sup> The causes of this enforced repose are manifest — the negotiations between Henry and the Emperor, the uncertainty of the success of the Pope on his return to Italy. It would have been perilous policy, either for him to risk, or for the Pope not to inhibit any rash measure.

In the second year of his seclusion, when he found that the King's heart was still hardened, the fire, not, we are assured by his followers, of resentment, but of parental love, not zeal for vengeance but for justice, burned within his soul. Henry was at this time in France. Three times the exile cited his sovereign with the tone of a superior to submit <sup>Becket cites the King.</sup> to his censure. Becket had communicated his design to his followers: — “Let us act as the Lord commanded his steward:”<sup>3</sup> “See, I have set thee over the nations,

<sup>1</sup> The letter in Giles (vi. 279) is rather perplexing. It is placed by Bouquet, agreeing with Baronius, in 1166; by Von Raumer (*Geschichte der Hohenstauffen*, ii. p. 192) in 1165, before the Diet of Wurtzburg. This cannot be right, as the letter implies that Alexander was in Rome, where he arrived not before Nov. 1165. The embassy, though it seems that the Emperor granted the safe-conduct, did not take place, at least as regards some of the ambassadors.

<sup>2</sup> “Itaque per biennium ferme stetit.” So writes Roger of Pontigny. It is difficult to make out so long a time. — p. 154.

<sup>3</sup> Herbert de Bosham. — p. 226.



and over the kingdoms, to root out and to pull down, and to destroy, and to hew down, to build and to plant.' ”<sup>1</sup> All his hearers applauded his righteous resolution. In the first message the haughty meaning was veiled in the blindest words,<sup>2</sup> and sent by a Cistercian of gentle demeanor, named Urban.<sup>3</sup> The King returned a short and bitter answer. The second time Becket wrote in severer language, but yet in the spirit, 'tis said, of compassion and leniency.<sup>4</sup> The King deigned no reply. His third messenger was a tattered, barefoot friar. To him Becket, it might seem, with studied insult, not only intrusted his letter to the King, but authorized the friar to speak in his name. With such a messenger the message was not likely to lose in asperity. The King returned an answer even more contemptuous than the address.<sup>5</sup>

But this secret arraignment of the King did not content the unquiet prelate. He could now dare more, unrestrained, unrebuked. Pope Alexander had been received at Rome with open arms: at the commencement of the present year all seemed to favor his cause. The Emperor, detained by wars in Germany, was not prepared to cross the Alps. In the free cities of Italy, the anti-imperialist feeling, and the growing republicanism, gladly entered into close confederacy with a Pope at war with the Emperor. The Pontiff (secretly it should seem, it might be in defiance or in

<sup>1</sup> Jer. i. 10.

<sup>2</sup> “Suavissimas literas, supplicationem solam, correptionem vero nullam vel *modicam* continentēs.” — De Bosham.

<sup>3</sup> Urbane by disposition as by name. — Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Giles, iii. 365. Bouquet, p. 243.

<sup>5</sup> “Quin potius dura propinantes, dura pro duris, immo multo plus *duriora* prioribus, reportaverunt.” — De Bosham.

revenge for Henry's threatened revolt and for the acts of his ambassadors at Wurtzburg<sup>1</sup>) ventured to grant to Becket a legatine power over the King's English dominions, except the province of York. Though it was not in the power of Becket to enter those dominions, it armed him, as it was thought, with unquestionable authority over Henry and his subjects. At all events it annulled whatever restraint the Pope, by counsel or by mandate, had placed on the proceedings of Becket.<sup>2</sup> The Archbishop took his determination alone.<sup>3</sup> As though to throw an awful mystery about his plan, he called his wise friends together, and consulted them on the propriety of resigning his see. With one voice they rejected the timid counsel. Yet though his most intimate followers were in ignorance of his designs, some intelligence of a meditated blow was betrayed to Henry. The King summoned an assembly of prelates at Chinon. The Bishops of Lisieux and Seez, whom the Archbishop of Rouen, Rotran, con-

<sup>1</sup> The Pope had written (Jan. 28) to the bishops of England not to presume to act without the consent of Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury. April 5, he forbade Roger of York and the other prelates to crown the King's son. May 3, he writes to Foliot and the bishops who had received benefices of the King to surrender them under pain of anathema; to Becket in favor of Joscelin, Bishop of Salisbury: he had annulled the grant of the deanery of Salisbury to John of Oxford. May 10, to the Archbishop of Rouen, denouncing the dealings of Henry with the Emperor and the Antipope. — Giles, iv. 10 *a* 80. Bouquet, 246.

<sup>2</sup> The inhibition given at Sens to proceed against the King, before the Easter of the following year (A.D. 1166), had now expired. Moreover he had a direct commission to proceed by Commination against those who forcibly withheld the property of the see of Canterbury. — Apud Giles, iv. 8. Bouquet, xvi. 844. At the same time the Pope urged great discretion as to the King's person. — Giles, iv. 12. Bouquet, 244.

<sup>3</sup> At the same time Becket wrote to Foliot of London, commanding him under penalty of excommunication to transmit to him the sequestered revenues of Canterbury in his hands. — Foliot appealed to the Pope. — Foliot's Letter. Giles, vi. 5. Bouquet, 215.

sented to accompany as a mediator, were despatched to Pontigny, to anticipate by an appeal to the Pope, any sentence which might be pronounced by Becket. They did not find him there: he had already gone to Soissons, on the pretext of a pilgrimage to the shrine of St. Drausus, a saint whose intercession rendered the warrior invincible in battle. Did Becket hope thus to secure victory in the great spiritual combat? One whole night he passed before the shrine of St. Drausus: another before that of Gregory the Great, the founder of the English Church, and of the see of Canterbury; a third before that of the Virgin, his especial patroness.

From thence he proceeded to the ancient and famous monastery of Vezelay.<sup>1</sup> The church of Vezelay, if the dismal decorations of the architecture are (which is doubtful) of that period, might seem designated for that fearful ceremony.<sup>2</sup> There, on the

Becket at  
Vezelay.

<sup>1</sup> The curious History of the Monastery of Vezelay, by Hugh of Poitiers, (translated in Guizot, Collection des Mémoires), though it twice mentions Becket, stops just short of this excommunication, 1166. Vezelay boasted to be subject only to the See of Rome, to have been made by its founder part of the patrimony of St. Peter. This was one great distinction: the other was the unquestioned possession of the body of St. Mary Magdalene, "l'amie de Dieu." Vezelay had been in constant strife with the Bishop of Autun for its ecclesiastical, with the Count of Nevers for its territorial, independence; with the monastery of Clugny, as its rival. This is a document very instructive as to the life of the age.

<sup>2</sup> A modern traveller thus writes of the church of Vezelay: "On voit par le choix des sujets qui ont un sens, quel était l'esprit du temps et la manière d'interpréter la religion. Ce n'était pas par la douceur ou la persuasion qu'on voulait convertir, mais bien par la terreur. Les discours des prêtres pourraient se résumer en ce peu de mots: 'Croyez, ou sinon vous périrez misérablement, et vous serez éternellement tourmentés dans l'autre monde!' De leur côté, les artistes, gens religieux, ecclésiastiques même pour la plupart, donnaient une forme réelle aux sombres images que leur inspirait un zèle farouche. Je ne trouve à Vezelay aucun de ces sujets que les âmes tendres aimeraient à retracer, tels que le pardon accordé au

feast of the Ascension,<sup>1</sup> when the church was crowded with worshippers from all quarters, he ascended the pulpit, and, with the utmost solemnity, condemned and annulled the Constitutions of Clarendon, declared excommunicate all who observed or enforced their observance, all who had counselled, and all who had defended them; absolved all the bishops from the oaths which they had taken to maintain them. This sweeping anathema involved the whole kingdom. But he proceeded to excommunicate by name the most active and powerful adversaries: John of Oxford, for his dealings with the schismatic partisans of the Emperor and of the Antipope, and for his usurpation of the deanery of Salisbury; Richard of Ilchester Archdeacon of Poitiers, the colleague of John in his negotiations at Wurtzburg (thus the cause of Becket and Pope Alexander were indissolubly welded together); the great Justiciary, Richard de Luci, and John of Baliol, the authors of the Constitutions of Clarendon; Randolph de Broc, Hugo de Clare, and others, for their forcible usurpation of the estates of the see of Canterbury. He yet in his mercy spared the king (he had received in-

repentir la récompense du juste, etc.; mais, au contraire, je vois Samuel égorgeant Agag; des diables écartelant des damnés, ou les entraînant dans l'abîme; puis des animaux horribles, des monstres hideux, des têtes grimaçantes exprimant ou les souffrances des reprouvés, ou la joie des habitans de l'enfer. Qu'on se représente la dévotion des hommes élevés au milieu de ces images, et l'on s'étonnera moins des massacres des Albigeois." — Notes d'un Voyage dans le Midi de la France, par Prosper Mérimée, p. 43.

<sup>1</sup> Diceto gives the date Ascension Day, Herbert de Bosham St. Mary Magdalene's Day (July 22d). It should seem that De Besham's memory failed him. See the letter of Nicolas de M. Rotomagensi, who speaks of the excommunication as past, and that Becket was expected to excommunicate *the King* on St. Mary Magdalene's day. This, if done at Vezelay (as it were, over the body of the Saint, on her sacred day), had been tenfold more awful.

telligence that Henry was dangerously ill), and in a lower tone, his voice, as it seemed, half choked with tears, he uttered his commination. The whole congregation, even his own intimate followers, were silent with amazement.

This sentence of excommunication Becket announced to the Pope, and to all the clergy of England. To the latter he said, "Who presumes to doubt that the priests of God are the fathers and masters of kings, princes, and all the faithful?" He commanded Gilbert, Bishop of London, and his other suffragans, to publish this edict throughout their dioceses. He did not confine himself to the bishops of England; the Norman prelates, the Archbishop of Rouen, were expressly warned to withdraw from all communion with the excommunicate.<sup>1</sup>

The wrath of Henry drove him almost to madness. No one dared to name Becket in his presence.<sup>2</sup> Soon after, on the occasion of some discussion about the King of Scotland, he burst into a fit of passion, threw away his cap, ungirt his belt, stripped off his clothes, tore the silken coverlid from his bed, and crouched down on the straw, gnawing bits of it with his teeth.<sup>3</sup> Proclamation was issued to guard the ports of England against the threatened interdict. Any one who should be apprehended as the bearer of such an instrument, if a regular, was to lose his feet; if a clerk, his eyes, and suffer more

Anger of the  
King.

<sup>1</sup> See the curious letter of Nicolas de Monte Rotomagensi, Giles, iv., Bouquet, 250. This measure of Becket was imputed by the Archbishop of Rheims to pride or anger ("extollentiæ aut iræ"): it made an unfavorable impression on the Empress Matilda. — Ibid.

<sup>2</sup> Epist. Giles, iv. 185; Bouquet, 258.

<sup>3</sup> Epist. Giles, iv. 260; Bouquet, 256.



shameful mutilation; a layman was to be hanged; a leper to be burned. A bishop who left the kingdom, for fear of the interdict, was to carry nothing with him but his staff. All exiles were to return on pain of losing their benefices. Priests who refused to chant the service were to be mutilated, and all rebels to forfeit their lands. An oath was to be administered by the sheriffs to all adults, that they would respect no ecclesiastical censure from the Archbishop.

A second time Henry's ungovernable passion betrayed him into a step which, instead of lowering, only placed his antagonist in a more formidable position. He determined to drive him from his retreat <sup>Becket</sup> at Pontigny. He sent word to the general of <sup>driven from</sup> Pontigny. the Cistercian order, that it was at their peril, if they harbored a traitor to his throne. The Cistercians possessed many rich abbeys in England; they dared not defy at once the King's resentment and rapacity. It was intimated to the Abbot of Pontigny, that he must dismiss his guest. The Abbot courteously communicated to Becket the danger incurred by the Order. He could not but withdraw; but instead now of lurking in a remote monastery, in some degree secluded from the public gaze, he was received in the archiepiscopal city of Sens; his honorable residence was prepared in a monastery close to the city; he lived in ostentatious communication with the Archbishop William, one of his most zealous partisans.<sup>1</sup>

But the fury of haughtiness in Becket equalled the fury of resentment in the King: yet it was not without subtlety. Just before the scene at Vezelay, it has been said, the King had sent the Archbishop of Rouen and

<sup>1</sup> Herbert de Bosham, p. 232.

the Bishop of Lisieux to Pontigny, to lodge his appeal to the Pope. Becket, duly informed by his emissaries at the court, had taken care to be absent. He eluded likewise the personal service of the appeal of the English clergy. An active and violent correspondence ensued. The remonstrance, purporting to be Controversy with English clergy. from the Primate's suffragans and the whole clergy of England, was not without dignified calmness. With covert irony, indeed, they said that they had derived great consolation from the hope that, when abroad, he would cease to rebel against the King and the peace of the realm ; that he would devote his days to study and prayer, and redeem his lost time by fasting, watching, and weeping ; they reproached him with the former favors of the King, with the design of estranging the King from Pope Alexander ; they asserted the readiness of the King to do full justice, and concluded by lodging an appeal until the Ascension-day of the following year.<sup>1</sup> Foliot was no doubt the author of this remonstrance, and between the Primate and the Bishop of London broke out a fierce warfare of letters. With Foliot Becket kept no terms. "You complain that the Bishop of Salisbury has been excommunicated, without citation, without hearing, without judgment. Remember the fate of Ucalegon. He trembled when his neighbor's house was on fire." To Foliot he asserted the preëminence, the supremacy, the divinity of the spiritual power without reserve. "Let not your liege lord be ashamed to defer to those to whom God himself defers, and calls them 'Gods.'"<sup>2</sup> Foliot replied

<sup>1</sup> Epist. Giles, vi. 158; Bouquet, 259.

<sup>2</sup> "Non indignetur itaque Dominus noster deferre illis, quibus summus omnium deferre non dedignatur, Deos appellans eos sæpius in sacris literis.

with what may be received as the manifesto of his party, and as the manifesto of a party to be received with some mistrust, yet singularly curious, as showing the tone of defence taken by the opponents of the Primate among the English clergy.<sup>1</sup>

The address of the English prelates to Pope Alexander was more moderate, and drawn with great ability. It asserted the justice, the obedience to the Church, the great virtue and (a bold assertion!) the conjugal fidelity of the King. The King had at once obeyed the citation of the Bishops of London and Salisbury, concerning some encroachments on the Church condemned by the Pope. The sole design of Henry had been to promote good morals, and to maintain the peace of the realm. That peace had been restored. All resentments had died away, when Becket fiercely recommenced the strife; in sad and terrible letters had threatened the King with excommunication, the realm with interdict. He had suspended the Bishop of Salisbury without trial. "This was the whole of the cruelty, perversity, malignity of the King against the Church, declaimed on and bruited abroad throughout the world."<sup>2</sup>

The indefatigable John of Oxford was in Rome, perhaps the bearer of this address. Becket <sup>John of Oxford at Rome.</sup> wrote to the Pope, insisting on all the cruelties of the King: he calls him a malignant tyrant,

*Sic enim dixit, 'Ego dixit, Dii estis,' et 'Constitui te Deum Pharaonis,' et 'Deis non detrahere.'* — *Epist. Giles, iii. p. 287; Bouquet, 261.*

<sup>1</sup> Foliot took the precaution of paying into the exchequer all that he had received from the sequestered property of the see of Canterbury. — *Giles, v. p. 265. Lyttelton in Appendice.*

<sup>2</sup> "Hæc est Domini regis toto orbe declamata crudelitas, hæc ab eo persecutio, hæc operum ejus perversorum rumusculis undique divulgata malignitas." — *Giles, vi. 190; Bouquet, 265.*

one full of all malice. He dwelt especially on the imprisonment of one of his chaplains, for which violation of the sacred person of a clerk, the King was *ipso facto* excommunicate. "Christ was crucified anew in Becket."<sup>1</sup> He complained of the presumption of Foliot, who had usurped the power of primate;<sup>2</sup> warned the Pope against the wiles of John of Oxford; deprecated the legatine mission, of which he had already heard a rumor, of William of Pavia. And all these letters, so unsparing to the King, or copies of them, probably bought out of the Roman chancery, were regularly transmitted to the King.

John of Oxford began his mission at Rome by swearing undauntedly, that nothing had been done at Wurtzburg against the power of the Church or the interests of Pope Alexander.<sup>3</sup> He surrendered his deanery of Salisbury into the hands of the Pope, and received it back again.<sup>4</sup> John of Oxford was armed

<sup>1</sup> Giles, iii. 6; Bouquet, 266. Compare letter of Bishop Elect of Chartres. — Giles, vi. 211; Bouquet, 269.

<sup>2</sup> Foliot obtained letters either at this time or somewhat later from his own Chapter of St. Paul, from many of the greatest dignitaries of the English Church, the abbots of Westminster and Reading, and from some distinguished foreign ecclesiastics, in favor of himself, his piety, churchmanship, and impartiality.

<sup>3</sup> The German accounts are unanimous about the proceedings at Wurtzburg and the oath of the English ambassadors. See the account in Von Raumer (*loc. cit.*), especially of the conduct of Reginald of Cologne, and the authorities. John of Oxford is henceforth called, in John of Salisbury's letters, jurator. Becket repeatedly charges him with perjury, — Giles, iii. p. 129 and 351; Bouquet, 280. Becket there says that John of Oxford had given up part of the "customs." He begs John of Poitiers to let the King know this. See the very curious answer of John of Poitiers. — Giles, vi. 251; Bouquet, 280. It appears that as all Becket's letters to the Pope were copied and transmitted from Rome to Henry, so John of Poitiers, outwardly the King's loyal subject, is the secret spy of Becket. He speaks of those in England who thirst after Becket's blood.

<sup>4</sup> The Pope acknowledges that this was extorted from him by fear of

with more powerful weapons than perjury or submission, and the times now favored the use of these more irresistible arms. The Emperor Frederick was levying, if he had not already set in motion, that mighty army which swept, during the next year, through Italy, made him master of Rome, and witnessed his coronation and the enthronement of the Antipope.<sup>1</sup> Henry had now, notwithstanding his suspicious — more than suspicious — dealings with the Emperor, returned to his allegiance to Alexander. Vast sums of English money were from this time expended in strengthening the cause of the Pope. The Guelfic cities of Italy received them with greedy hands. By the gold of the King of England, and of the King of Sicily, the Frangipani and the family of Peter Leonis were retained in their fidelity to the Pope. Becket, on the other hand, had powerful friends in Rome, especially the Cardinal Hyacinth, to whom he writes, that Henry had boasted that in Rome everything was venal. It was, however, not till a second embassy arrived, consisting Dec. 1166. of John Cummin and Ralph of Tamworth, that Alexander made his great concession, the sign that he was not yet extricated from his distress. He appointed William of Pavia, and Otho, Cardinal of St. Nicolas, his legates in France, to decide the cause.<sup>2</sup> Meantime all Becket's acts were suspended by the papal authority. At the same time the Pope wrote to Becket,

Henry, and makes an awkward apology to Becket. — Giles, iv. 18; Bouquet, 309.

<sup>1</sup> He was crowned in Rome August 1. Compare next chapter — Sismondi, *Républiques Italiennes*, ii. ch. x.; Von Raumer, ii. p. 209, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Giles, iii. 128; Bouquet, 272. Compare letters to Cardinals Boso and Henry. — Giles, iii. 103, 113; Bouquet, 174. Letter to Henry announcing the appointment, December 20.



entreating him at this perilous time of the Church to make all possible concessions, and to dissemble, if necessary, for the present.<sup>1</sup>

If John of Oxford boasted prematurely of his triumph (on his return to England he took ostentatious possession of his deanery of Salisbury),<sup>2</sup> and predicted the utter ruin of Becket, his friends, especially the King of France,<sup>3</sup> were in utter dismay at this change in the papal policy. John, as Becket had heard (and his emissaries were everywhere), on his landing in England, had met the Bishop of Hereford (one of the wavering bishops), prepared to cross the sea in obedience to Becket's citation. To him, after some delay, John had exhibited letters of the Pope, which sent him back to his diocese. On the sight of these same letters, the Bishop of London had exclaimed in the fulness of his joy, "Then our Thomas is no longer archbishop!" "If this be true," adds Becket, "the Pope has given a death-blow to the Church."<sup>4</sup> To the Archbishop of Mentz, for in the empire he had his ardent admirers, he poured forth all the bitterness of his soul.<sup>5</sup> Of the two cardinals he writes, "The one is weak and versatile, the other treacherous and crafty." He looked to their arrival with indignant apprehension. They

<sup>1</sup> "Si non omnia secundum beneplacitum succedant, ad præsens dissimulet." — Giles, vi. 15; Bouquet, 277.

<sup>2</sup> See the curious letter of Master Lombard, Becket's instructor in the canon law, who boldly remonstrates with the Pope. He asserts that Henry was so frightened at the menace of excommunication, his subjects, even the bishops, at that of his interdict, that they were in despair. Their only hope was in the death or some great disaster of the Pope. — Giles, iv. 208; Bouquet, 282.

<sup>3</sup> See Letters of Louis; Giles, iv. 308; Bouquet, 287.

<sup>4</sup> "Strangulavit," a favorite word. — Giles, iii, 214; Bouquet, 284.

<sup>5</sup> Giles, iii. 235; Bouquet, 285.

are open to bribes, and may be perverted to any injustice.<sup>1</sup>

John of Oxford had proclaimed that the cardinals, William of Pavia, and Otho, were invested in full powers to pass judgment between the King and the Primate.<sup>2</sup> But whether John of Oxford had mistaken or exaggerated their powers, or the Pope (no improbable case, considering the change of affairs in Italy) had thought fit afterwards to modify or retract them, they came rather as mediators than judges, with orders to reconcile the contending parties, rather than to decide on their cause. The cardinals did not arrive in France till the autumn of the year.<sup>3</sup> Even before their arrival, first rumors, then more certain intelligence had been propagated throughout Christendom of the terrible disaster which had befallen the Emperor. Barbarossa's career of vengeance and conquest had been cut short. The Pope a prisoner, a fugitive, was unexpectedly released, restored to power, if not to

A.D. 1167.

Flight of  
Frederick.

<sup>1</sup> Compare John of Salisbury, p. 539. "Scripsit autem rex Domino *Coloniensi*, Henricum Pisanum et Willelmum Papiensem in Franciam venturos ad novas exactiones faciendas, ut undique conradant et contrahant, unde Papa Alexander in urbe sustentetur: alter, ut nostis, levis est et mutabilis, alter dolosus et fraudulentus, uterque cupidus et avarus: et ideo de facili munera cœnabunt eos et ad omnem injustitiam incurvabunt. Audito eorum detestando adventu formidare cæpi præsentiam eorum causæ vestræ multum nocituram; et ne vestro et vestrorum sanguine gratiam Regis Angliæ redimere non erubescant." He refers with great joy to the insurrection of the Saxons against the Emperor. He says elsewhere of Henry of Pisa, "Vir bonæ opinionis est, sed Romanus et Cardinalis." — Epist. cc. ii.

<sup>2</sup> The English bishops declare to the Pope himself that they had received this concession, *scripto formatum*, from the Pope, and that the King was furious at what he thought a deception. — Giles, vi. 194; Bouquet, 304.

<sup>3</sup> The Pope wrote to the legates to soothe Becket and the King of France; he accuses John of Oxford of spreading false reports about the extent of their commission; John Cummin of betraying his letters to the Antipope. — Giles, vi. 54.

the possession of Rome.<sup>1</sup> The climate of Rome, as usual, but in a far more fearful manner, had resented the invasion of the city by the German army. A pestilence had broken out, which in less than a month made such havoc among the soldiers, that they could scarcely find room to bury the dead. The fever seemed to choose its victims among the higher clergy, the partisans of the Antipope; of the princes and nobles, the chief victims were the younger Duke Guelf, Duke Frederick of Swabia, and some others; of the bishops, those of Prague, Ratisbon, Augsburg, Spire, Verdun, Liege, Zeitz; and the arch-rebel himself, the antipope-maker, Reginald of Cologne.<sup>2</sup> Throughout Europe the clergy on the side of Alexander raised a cry of awful exultation; it was God manifestly avenging himself on the enemies of the Church; the new Sennacherib (so he is called by Becket) had been smitten in his pride; and the example of this chastisement of Frederick was a command to the Church to resist to the last all rebels against her power, to put forth her spiritual arms, which God would as assuredly support by the same or more signal wonders. The defeat of Frederick was an admonition to the Pope to lay bare the sword of Peter, and smite on all sides.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> So completely does Becket's fortune follow that of the Pope, that on June 17 Alexander writes to permit Roger of York to crown the King's son; no sooner is he safe in Benevento, August 22 (perhaps the fever had begun), than he writes to his legates to confirm the excommunications of Becket, which he had suspended.

<sup>2</sup> Muratori, *sub ann.* 1167; Von Raumer, ii. 210. On the 1st of August Frederick was crowned; September 4, he is at the Pass of Pontremoli, in full retreat, or rather flight.

<sup>3</sup> In a curious passage in a letter written by Herbert de Bosham in the name of Becket, Frederick's defeat is compared to Henry's disgraceful campaign in Wales. "My enemy," says Becket, "in the abundance of his

There can be no doubt that Becket so interpreted what he deemed a sign from heaven. But <sup>Becket</sup> even before the disaster was certainly known <sup>against the</sup> <sup>legates.</sup> he had determined to show no submission to a judge so partial and so corrupt as William of Pavia.<sup>1</sup> That cardinal had urged the Pope at Sens to accept Becket's resignation of his see. Becket would not deign to disguise his contempt. He wrote a letter so full of violence that John of Salisbury,<sup>2</sup> to whom it was submitted, persuaded him to destroy it. A second was little milder; at length he was persuaded to take a more moderate tone. Yet even then he speaks of the "insolence of princes lifting up their horn." To Cardinal Otho, on the other hand, his language borders on adulation.

The cardinal Legates travelled in slow state. They visited first Becket at Sens, afterwards King <sup>Meeting</sup> Henry at Rouen. At length a meeting was <sup>near</sup> <sup>Gisors.</sup> agreed on to be held on the borders of the French and English territory, between Gisors and Trie. The proud Becket was disturbed at being hastily summoned, when he was unable to muster a sufficient retinue of horsemen to meet the Italian cardinals. The two kings were there. Of Henry's prelates the Archbishop of Rouen alone was present at the first interview. Becket was charged with urging the King of France to war

valor, could not prevail against a breechless and ragged people ('exbraccatum et pannosum'). — Giles, viii. p. 268.

<sup>1</sup> "Credimus non esse juri consentaneum, nos ejus subire judicium vel examen qui quærit sibi facere commercium de sanguine nostro, de pretio utinam non iniquitatis, quærit sibi nomen et gloriam." — D. Thom. Epist. Giles, iii. p. 15. The two legates are described as "plus avaritiæ quam justitiæ studiosi." — W. Cant. p. 21.

<sup>2</sup> Giles, iii. 157, and John of Salisbury's remarkable expostulatory letter upon Becket's violence. — Bouquet, p. 566.

against his master. On the following day the King of France said in the presence of the cardinals, that this impeachment on Becket's loyalty was false. Octave of St. Martin. Nov. 23. To all the persuasions, menaces, entreaties of the cardinals<sup>1</sup> Becket declared that he would submit, "saving the honor of God, and of the Apostolic See, the liberty of the Church, the dignity of his person, and the property of the churches. As to the Customs he declared that he would rather bow his neck to the executioner than swear to observe them. He peremptorily demanded his own restoration at once to all the honors and possessions of the see." The third question was on the appeal of the bishops. Becket inveighed with bitterness on their treachery towards him, their servility to the King. "When the shepherds fled all Egypt returned to idolatry." Becket interpreted these "shepherds" as the clergy.<sup>2</sup> He compares them to the slaves in the old comedy; he declared that he would submit to no judgment on that point but that of the Pope himself.

The Cardinals proceeded to the King. They were The Cardinals before the King. received but coldly at Argences, not far from Caen, at a great meeting with the Norman and English prelates. The Bishop of London entered at length into the King's grievances and his own; Becket's debt to the King,<sup>3</sup> his usurpations on the see of London. At the close Henry, in tears, entreated the cardinals to rid him of the troublesome churchman. William of Pavia wept, or seemed to

<sup>1</sup> Herbert de Bosham, p. 248; Epist. Giles, iii. 16; Bouquet, 296.

<sup>2</sup> Giles, iii. p. 21. Compare the whole letter.

<sup>3</sup> Foliot rather profanely said, the primate seems to think that as sin is washed away in baptism, so debts are cancelled by promotion.



weep from sympathy. Otho, writes Becket's emissary, could hardly suppress his laughter. The English prelates afterwards at Le Mans solemnly renewed their appeal. Their appeal was accompanied with a letter, in which they complain that Becket would leave them exposed to the wrath of the King, from which wrath he himself had fled;<sup>1</sup> of false representations of the Customs, and disregard of all justice and of the sacred canons in suspending and anathematizing the clergy without hearing and without trial. William of Pavia gave notice of the appeal for the next St. Martin's Day (so a year was to elapse), with command to abstain from all excommunication and interdict of the kingdom till that day.<sup>2</sup> Both cardinals wrote strongly to the Pope in favor of the Bishop of London.<sup>3</sup>

At this suspension Becket wrote to the Pope in a tone of mingled grief and indignation.<sup>4</sup> He described himself as the most wretched of men: applied the prophetic description of the Saviour's unequalled sorrow to himself. He inveighed against William of Pavia:<sup>5</sup> he threw himself on the justice and compassion of the Pope. But this inhibition was confirmed by Dec. 29. the Pope himself, in answer to another embassy of

<sup>1</sup> "Ad mortem nos invitat et sanguinis effusionem, cum ipse mortem, quam nemo sibi dignabatur aut minabatur inferre, summo studio declinaverit et suum sanguinem illibatum conservando, ejus nec guttam effundi voluerit." — Giles, vi. 196. Bouquet, 304.

<sup>2</sup> Giles, vi. 148. Bouquet, 304.

<sup>3</sup> Giles, vi. 135, 141. Bouquet, 306. William of Pavia recommended the translation of Becket to some other see.

<sup>4</sup> Giles, iii. 28. Bouquet, 306.

<sup>5</sup> One of his letters to William of Pavia begins with this fierce denunciation: "Non credebam me tibi venalem proponendum emptoribus, ut de sanguine meo compareres tibi compendium de pretio iniquitatis, faciens tibi nomen et gloriam." — Giles, iii. 153. Becket always represents his enemies as thirsting after his blood.

Henry, consisting of Clarembold, Prior Elect of St. Augustine's, the Archdeacon of Salisbury, and others.<sup>1</sup> This important favor was obtained through the interest of Cardinal John of Naples, who expresses his hope that the insolent Archbishop must at length see that he had no resource but in submission.

Becket wrote again and again to the Pope, bitterly  
May 19.  
Becket to the  
Pope. complaining that the successive ambassadors of the King, John of Oxford, John Cummin, the Prior of St. Augustine's, returned from Rome each with larger concessions.<sup>2</sup> The Pope acknowledged that the concessions had been extorted from him. The ambassadors of Henry had threatened to leave the Papal Court, if their demands were not complied with, in open hostility. The Pope was still an exile in Benevento,<sup>3</sup> and did not dare to reoccupy Rome. The Emperor, even after his discomfiture, was still formidable; he might collect another overwhelming Transalpine force. The subsidies of Henry to the Italian cities and to the Roman partisans of the Pope could not be spared. The Pontiff therefore wrote soothing letters to the King of France and to Becket. He insinuated that these concessions were but for a time. "For a time!" replied Becket in an answer full of fire and passion: "and in that time the Church of England falls utterly to ruin; the property of the Church and the poor is wrested from her. In that time prelaties and abbacies are confiscated to the King's use: in that time who will guard the flock when the wolf is in the

<sup>1</sup> Giles, iv. 128; vi. 133. Bouquet, 312, 313.

<sup>2</sup> Epist. Giles, ii. 24.

<sup>3</sup> He was at Benevento, though with different degrees of power, from Aug. 22, 1167, to Feb. 24, 1170.

fold? This fatal dispensation will be a precedent for all ages. But for me and my fellow-exiles all authority of Rome had ceased forever in England. There had been no one who had maintained the Pope against kings and princes." His significant language involves the Pope himself in the general and unsparing charge of rapacity and venality with which he brands the court of Rome. "I shall have to give an account at the last day, where gold and silver are of no avail, nor gifts which blind the eyes even of the wise."<sup>1</sup> The same contemptuous allusions to that notorious venality transpire in a vehement letter addressed to the <sup>To the</sup> College of Cardinals, in which he urges that <sup>Cardinals.</sup> his cause is their own; that they are sanctioning a fatal and irretrievable example to temporal princes; that they are abrogating all obedience to the Church. "Your gold and silver will not deliver you in the day of the wrath of the Lord."<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, the King and the Queen of France wrote in a tone of indignant remonstrance that the Pope had abandoned the cause of the enemy of their enemy. More than one of the French prelates who wrote in the same strain declared that their King, in his resentment, had seriously thought of defection to the Antipope, and of a close connection with the Imperial family.<sup>3</sup> Alexander determined to make another attempt at reconciliation; at least he should gain time, that precious source of hope to the embarrassed and irresolute. His mediators were the Prior of Montdieu and Bernard de Corilo, a

<sup>1</sup> Giles, iii. p. 55. Bouquet, 317. Read the whole letter beginning "Anima mea."

<sup>2</sup> Bouquet, 324.

<sup>3</sup> Epist. Giles, iv. Bouquet, 320.

monk of Grammont.<sup>1</sup> It was a fortunate time, for just at this juncture, peace and even amity seemed to be established between the Kings of France and England. Many of the great Norman and French prelates and nobles offered themselves as joint mediators with the commissioners of the Pope.

A vast assembly was convened on the day of the Meeting at Montmirail. Epiphany in the plains near Montmirail, where in the presence of the two kings and the barons of each realm the reconciliation was to take place. Becket held a long conference with the mediators. He proposed, instead of the obnoxious phrase "saving my order," to substitute "saving the honor of God;"<sup>2</sup> the mediators of the treaty insisted on his throwing himself on the king's mercy absolutely and without reservation. With great reluctance Becket appeared at least to yield: his counsellors acquiesced in silence. With this distinct understanding the Kings of France and England met at Montmirail, and everything seemed prepared for the final settlement of this Jan. 6, 1169. long and obstinate quarrel. The Kings awaited the approach of the Primate. But as he was on his way, De Bosham (who always assumes to himself the credit of suggesting Becket's most haughty proceedings) whispered in his ear (De Bosham himself asserts this) a solemn caution, lest he should act over again the fatal scene of weakness at Clarendon. Becket had

<sup>1</sup> Their instructions are dated May 25, 1168. See also the wavering letters to Becket and the King of France. — Giles, iv. p. 25, p. 111.

<sup>2</sup> "Sed quid? Nobis ita consilium suspendentibus et hæsitantibus quid agendum a pacis mediatoribus, multis et magnis viris, et præsertim qui inter ipsos a viris religiosis et aliis archipræsuli amicissimis et familiarissimis, adeo sicut et supra diximus, suusus, tractus et impulsus est, ut haberetur persuasus." — De Bosham, p. 268.

not time to answer De Bosham: he advanced to the King and threw himself at his feet. Henry raised him instantly from the ground. Becket, standing upright, began to solicit the clemency of the King. He declared his readiness to submit his whole cause to the judgment of the two Kings and of the assembled prelates and nobles. After a pause he added, "Saving the honor of God."<sup>1</sup>

At this unexpected breach of his agreement the mediators, even the most ardent admirers of Becket, stood aghast. Henry, thinking himself duped, as <sup>Treaty</sup> well he might, broke out into one of his un-<sup>broken off.</sup>governable fits of anger. He reproached the Archbishop with arrogance, obstinacy, and ingratitude. He so far forgot himself as to declare that Becket had displayed all his magnificence and prodigality as chancellor only to court popularity and to supplant his king in the affections of his people. Becket listened with patience, and appealed to the King of France as witness to his loyalty. Henry fiercely interrupted him. "Mark, Sire (he addressed the King of France), the infatuation and pride of the man: he pretends to have been banished, though he fled from his see. He would persuade you that he is maintaining the cause of the Church, and suffering for the sake of justice. I have always been willing, and am still willing, to grant that he should rule his Church with the same liberty as his predecessors, men not less holy than himself." Even the King of France seemed shocked at the conduct of

<sup>1</sup> "Sed mox adjecit, quod nec rex nec pacis mediatores, vel alii, vel etiam sui propriè æstimaverunt, ut adjiceret videlicet 'Salvo honore Dei.'" — De Bosham, p. 262. In his account to the Pope of this meeting, Becket suppresses his own tergiversation on this point. — Epist. Giles, iii. p. 43. Compare John of Salisbury (who was not present). Bouquet, 395.



Becket. The prelates and nobles, having in vain labored to bend the inflexible spirit of the Primate, retired in sullen dissatisfaction. He stood alone. Even John of Poitiers, his most ardent admirer, followed him to Etampes, and entreated him to yield. "And you, too," returned Becket, "will you strangle us, and give triumph to the malignity of our enemies?"<sup>1</sup>

The King of England retired, followed by the Papal Legates, who, though they held letters of Commination from the Pope,<sup>2</sup> delayed to serve them on the King. Becket followed the King of France to Montmirail. He was received by Louis; and Becket put on so cheerful a countenance as to surprise all present. On his return to Sens, he explained to his followers that his cause was not only that of the Church, but of God.<sup>3</sup> He passed among the acclamations of the populace, ignorant of his duplicity. "Behold the prelate who stood up even before two kings for the honor of God."

Becket may have had foresight, or even secret information of the hollowness of the peace between the two kings. Before many days, some acts of barbarous  
War of  
France and  
England.
cruelty by Henry against his rebellious subjects plunged the two nations again in hostility.
The King of France and his prelates, feeling how nearly they had lost their powerful ally, began to admire what they called Becket's magnanimity as loudly as they had censured his obstinacy. The King

<sup>1</sup> "Ut quid nos et vos strangulatis?" — Epist. Giles, iii. 312.

<sup>2</sup> Throughout the Pope kept up his false game. He privately assured the King of France that he need not be alarmed if himself (Alexander) seemed to take part against the archbishop. The cause was safe in his bosom. See the curious letter of Matthew of Sens. — Epist. Giles, iv. p. 166.

<sup>3</sup> "Nunc præter ecclesiæ causam, expressam ipsius etiam Dei causam agebamus." — De Bosham, 272.

visited him at Sens: one of the Papal commissioners, the Monk of Grammont, said privately to Herbert de Bosham, that he had rather his foot had been cut off than that Becket should have listened to his advice.<sup>1</sup>

Becket now at once drew the sword and cast away the scabbard. "Cursed is he that refraineth his sword from blood." This Becket applied to the spiritual weapon. On Ascension Day he again solemnly excommunicated Gilbert Foliot Bishop of London, Joscelin of Salisbury, the Archdeacon of Salisbury, Richard de Luci, Randolph de Broc, and many other of Henry's most faithful counsellors. He announced this excommunication to the Archbishop of Rouen,<sup>2</sup> and reminded him that whosoever presumed to communicate with any one of these outlaws of the Church by word, in meat or drink, or even by salutation, subjected himself thereby to the same excommunication. The appeal to the Pope he treated with sovereign contempt. He sternly inhibited Roger of Worcester, who had entreated permission to communicate with his brethren.<sup>3</sup> "What fellowship is there between Christ and Belial?" He announced this act to the Pope, entreating, but with the tone of command, his approbation of the proceeding. An emissary of Becket had the boldness to enter St. Paul's Cathedral in London, to thrust the sentence into the hands of the officiating priest, and then to proclaim with a loud voice, "Know all men, that Gilbert Bishop of London is excommunicate by Thomas Archbishop of Canterbury and Legate of the Pope." He escaped with some

<sup>1</sup> De Bosham, 278.

<sup>2</sup> Giles, iii. 290; vi. 293. Bouquet, 346.

<sup>3</sup> Giles, iii. 322. Bouquet, 348.

difficulty from ill-usage by the people. Foliot immediately summoned his clergy; explained the illegality, injustice, nullity of an excommunication without citation, hearing, or trial, and renewed his appeal to the Pope. The Dean of St. Paul's and all the clergy, excepting the priests of certain monasteries, joined in the appeal. The Bishop of Exeter declined, nevertheless he gave to Foliot the kiss of peace.<sup>1</sup>

King Henry was not without fear at this last desperate blow. He had not a single chaplain who Henry's intrigues in Italy. had not been excommunicated, or was not virtually under ban for holding intercourse with persons under excommunication.<sup>2</sup> He continued his active intrigues, his subsidies in Italy. He bought the support of Milan, Pavia, Cremona, Parma, Bologna. The Frangipani, the family of Leo, the people of Rome, were still kept in allegiance to the Pope chiefly by his lavish payments.<sup>3</sup> He made overtures to the King of Sicily, the Pope's ally, for a matrimonial alliance with his family: and finally, he urged the tempting offer to mediate a peace between the Emperor and the Pope. Reginald of Salisbury boasted that, if the Pope should die, Henry had the whole College of Cardinals in his pay, and could name his Pope.<sup>4</sup>

But no longer dependent on Henry's largesses to his partisans, Alexander's affairs wore a more prosperous aspect. He began, yet cautiously, to show his real bias.

<sup>1</sup> Epist. Giles, iv. 225.

<sup>2</sup> Fragm. Vit. Giles, i. p. 371.

<sup>3</sup> "Et quod omnes Romanos datâ pecuniâ inducant ut faciant fidelitatem domino Papæ, dummodo in nostrâ dejectione regis Angliæ satisfaciât voluntati." — Epist. ad Humbold. Card. Giles, iii. 123. Bouquet, 350. Compare Lambeth. on the effect of Italian affairs on the conduct of the Pope. — p. 106.

<sup>4</sup> Epist. 188, p. 266.

He determined to appoint a new legatine commission, not now rapacious cardinals and avowed partisans of Henry. The Nuncios were Gratian, a hard and severe canon lawyer, not likely to swerve from the loftiest claims of the Decretals; and Vivian, a man of more pliant character, but as far as he was firm in any principle, disposed to high ecclesiastical views. At the same time he urged Becket to issue no sentences against the King or the King's followers; or if, as he hardly believed, he had already done so, to suspend their powers.

The terrors of the excommunication were not without their effect in England. Some of the Bishops began gradually to recede from the King's party, and to incline to that of the Primate. Hereford had already attempted to cross the sea. Henry of Winchester was in private correspondence with Becket: he had throughout secretly supplied him with money.<sup>1</sup> Becket skilfully labored to awaken his old spirit of opposition to the Crown. He reminded Winchester of his royal descent, that he was secure in his powerful connections; "the impious one would not dare to strike him, for fear lest his kindred should avenge his cause."<sup>2</sup> Norwich, Worcester, Chester, Chichester, more than wavered. This movement was strengthened by a false step of Foliot, which exposed all his former proceedings to the charge of irregular ambition. He began to declare publicly not only that he never swore canonical obedience to Becket, but to

New Legatine  
Commission.  
Mar. 10, 1169.

English prelates  
waver.

<sup>1</sup> Fitz-Stephen, p. 271.

<sup>2</sup> "Domo vestra flagellum suspendit impius, ne quod promereret, propinquorum vestrorum ministerio veniat super eum." — Giles, iii. 338. Bouquet, 358.

assert the independence of the see of London and the right of the see of London to the primacy of England. Becket speaks of this as an act of spiritual parricide; Foliot was another Absalom.<sup>1</sup> He appealed to the pride and the fears of the Chapter of Canterbury: he exposed, and called on them to resist, these machinations of Foliot to degrade the archiepiscopal see. At the same time he warned all persons to abstain from communion with those who were under his ban; "for he had accurate information as to all who were guilty of that offence." Even in France this proceeding strengthened the sympathy with Becket. The Archbishop of Sens, the Bishops of Troyes, Paris, Noyon, Auxerre, Boulogne, wrote to the Pope to denounce this audacious impiety of the Bishop of London.

The first interview of the new Papal legates, Gratian and Vivian, with the King, is described with singular minuteness by a friend of Becket.<sup>2</sup> On the eve of St. Bartholomew's Day they arrived at Dampart. On their approach, Geoffry Ridel and Nigel Sackville stole out of the town. The King, as he came in from hunting, courteously stopped at the lodging of the Legates: as they were conversing the Prince rode up with a great blowing of horns from the chase, and presented a whole stag to the Legates. The next morning the King visited them, accompanied by the Bishops of Seez and of Rennes. Presently John of Oxford, Reginald of Salisbury, and the Archdeacon of Llandaff were admitted. The conference lasted the whole day, sometimes in amity, sometimes in strife. Just before sunset the King rushed out in wrath, swear-

Interview  
of the new  
Legates with  
the King.  
Aug. 23.

<sup>1</sup> Giles, iii. 201. Bouquet, 361.

<sup>2</sup> "Amici ad Thomam." — Giles, iv. 277. Bouquet, 370.



ing by the eyes of God that he would not submit to their terms. Gratian firmly replied, "Think not to threaten us; we come from a court which is accustomed to command Emperors and Kings." The King then summoned his barons to witness, together with his chaplains, what fair offers he had made. He departed somewhat pacified. The eighth day was appointed for the convention, at which the King and the Archbishop were again to meet in the presence of the Legates.

It was held at Bayeux. With the King appeared the Archbishops of Rouen and Bordeaux, the Aug. 31. Bishop of Le Mans, and all the Norman prelates. The second day arrived one English bishop — Worcester. John of Poitiers kept prudently away. The Legates presented the Pope's preceding letters in favor of Becket. The King, after stating his grievances,<sup>1</sup> said, "If for this man I do anything, on account of the Pope's entreaties, he ought to be very grateful." The next day at a place called Le Bar, the King requested the Legates to absolve his chaplains without any oath: on their refusal, the King mounted his horse, and swore that he would never listen to the Pope or any one else concerning the restoration of Becket. The prelates interceded; the Legates partially gave way. The King dismounted and renewed the conference. At length he consented to the return of Becket and all the exiles. He seemed delighted at this, and treated of other affairs. He returned again to the Legates, and demanded that they, or one of them, or at least some one commissioned by them, should cross over to

<sup>1</sup> Henry, it should be observed, waived all the demands which he had hitherto urged against Becket, for debts incurred during his chancellorship.

England to absolve all who had been excommunicated by the Primate. Gratian refused this with inflexible obstinacy. The King was again furious: "I care not an egg for you and your excommunications." He again mounted his horse, but at the earnest supplication of the prelates he returned once more. He demanded that they should write to the Pope to announce his pacific offers. The bishops explained to the King that the Legates had at last produced a positive mandate of the Pope, enjoining their absolute obedience to his Legates. The King replied, "I know that they will lay my realm under an interdict, but cannot I, who can take the strongest castle in a day, seize any ecclesiastic who shall presume to utter such an interdict?" Some concessions allayed his wrath, and he returned to his offers of reconciliation. Geoffrey Ridel and Nigel Sackville were absolved on the condition of declaring, with their hands on the Gospels, that they would obey the commands of the Legates. The King still pressing the visit of one of the Legates to England, Vivian consented to take the journey. The bishops were ordered to draw up the treaty; but the King insisted on a clause "Saving the honor of his Crown." They adjourned to a future day at Caen. The Bishop of Lisieux, adds the writer, flattered the King; the Archbishop of Rouen was for God and the Pope.

Two conferences at Caen and at Rouen were equally inconclusive; the King insisted on the words, "saving the dignity of my Crown." Becket inquired if he might add, "saving the liberty of the Church."<sup>1</sup>

The King threw all the blame of the final rupture

<sup>1</sup> Epist. Giles, iv. 216. Bouquet, 373.

on the Legates, who had agreed, he said, to this clause,<sup>1</sup> but through Becket's influence withdrew from their word.<sup>2</sup> He reminded the Pope that he had in his possession letters of his Holiness exempting him and his realm from all authority of the Primate till he should be received into the royal favor.<sup>3</sup> "If," he adds, "the Pope refuses my demands, he must henceforth despair of my good-will, and look to other quarters to protect his realm and his honor." Both parties renewed their appeals, their intrigues in Rome: Becket's complaints of Rome's venality became louder.<sup>4</sup>

Becket began again to fulminate his excommunications. Before his departure Gratian signified to Geoffrey Ridel and Nigel Sackville that their absolution was conditional; if peace was not ratified by Michaelmas, they were still under the ban. Becket menaced some old, some new victims, the Dean of Salisbury, John Cummin, the Archdeacon of Llandaff, and others.<sup>5</sup> But he now took a more decisive and terrible step. He wrote to the bishops of England,<sup>6</sup> commanding them to lay the whole kingdom under interdict; all divine of-

<sup>1</sup> "Revocato consensu," writes the Bishop of Nevers, a moderate prelate, who regrets the obstinacy of the nuncios. — Giles, vi. 266. Bouquet, 377. Compare the letter of the clergy of Normandy to the Pope. — Giles, vi. 177. Bouquet, 377.

<sup>2</sup> Becket thought, or pretended to think, that under the "dignitatibus" lurked the "consuetudinibus." — Giles, iii. 299. Bouquet, 379.

<sup>3</sup> "Ceteras vestras recepimus, et ipsas adhuc penes nos habemus, in quibus terram nostram et personas regni a prefata Cantuariensis potestate eximebatis, donec ipse in gratiam nostram rediisset." — Epist. Giles, vi. 291. Bouquet, 374.

<sup>4</sup> "Nam quod mundus sentit, dolet, ingemiscit, nullus adeo iniquam causam ad ecclesiam Romanam defert, quin ibi spe lucri concepta ne dixerim odore sordium, adiutorem inveniat et patronum." — Epist. iii. 133; Bouquet, 382.

<sup>5</sup> Giles, iii. 250; Bouquet, 387.

<sup>6</sup> Giles, iii. 334; Bouquet, 388.

fices were to cease except baptism, penance, and the viaticum, unless before the Feast of the Purification Nov. 2, 1170. the King should have given full satisfaction for his contumacy to the Church. This was to be done with closed doors, the laity expelled from the ceremony, with no bell tolling, no dirge wailing; all church music was to cease. The act was speedily announced to the chapters of Chichester, Lincoln, and Bath. Of the Pope he demanded that he would treat the King's ambassadors, Reginald of Salisbury and Richard Barre, one as actually excommunicate, the other as contaminated by intercourse with the excommunicate.<sup>1</sup>

The menace of the Interdict, with the fear that the Bishops of England, all but London and Salisbury, might be overawed into publishing it in their dioceses, threw Henry back into his usual irresolution. There were other alarming signs. Gratian had returned to Rome, accompanied by William, Archbishop of Sens, Becket's most faithful admirer. Rumors spread that William was to return invested in full legatine powers — William, not only Becket's friend, but the head of the French hierarchy. If the Interdict should be extended to his French dominions, and the Excommunication launched against his person, could he depend on the precarious fidelity of the Norman prelates? Differences had again arisen with the King of France.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Giles, iii. 42; Bouquet, 390. Reginald of Salisbury was an especial object of Becket's hate. He calls him one born in fornication ("fornicarium"), son of a priest. Reginald hated Becket with equal cordiality. Becket had betrayed him by a false promise of not injuring his father. "Quod utique ipsi non plus quam cani faceremus." — This letter contains Reginald's speech about Henry having the College of Cardinals in his pay. — Giles, iii. 225; Bouquet, 391.

<sup>2</sup> Becket writes to the Pope, January, 1170. "Nec vos oportet de cætero vereri, ne transeat ad schismaticos, quod sic eum Christus in manu famuli

Henry was seized with an access of devotion. He asked permission to offer his prayers at the shrines and at the Martyrs' Mount (Montmartre) at Paris. The pilgrimage would lead to an interview with the King of France, and offer an occasion of renewing the negotiations with Becket. Vivian was hastily summoned to turn back. His vanity was flattered by the hope of achieving that reconciliation which had failed with Gratian. He wrote to Becket requesting his presence. Becket, though he suspected Vivian, yet out of respect to the King of France, consented to approach as near as Château Corbeil. After the conference with the King of France, two petitions from Becket, in his usual tone of imperious humility, were presented to the King of England. The Primate condescended to entreat the favor of Henry, and the restoration of the church of Canterbury, in as ample a form as it was held before his exile. The second was more brief, but raised a new question of compensation for loss and damage during the archbishop's absence from his see.<sup>1</sup> Both parties mistrusted each other; each watched the other's words with captious jealousy. Vivian, weary of those verbal chicaneries of the King, declared that he had never met with so mendacious a man in his life.<sup>2</sup> Vivian might have remembered his own retractations,

Henry at  
Paris.

Nov. 1109.

Negotiations  
renewed.

*sui, regis Francorum subegit, ut ab obsequio ejus non possit amplius separari.*" — p. 48.

<sup>1</sup> Many difficult points arose. Did Becket demand not merely the actual possessions of the see, but all to which he laid claim? There were three estates held by William de Ros, Henry of Essex, and John the Marshall (the original object of dispute at Northampton?), which Becket specifically required and declared that he would not give up if exiled forever. — Epist. Giles, iii. 220; Bouquet, 400.

<sup>2</sup> Epist. Giles, iii. 262; Bouquet, 199.



still more those of Becket on former occasions. He withdrew from the negotiation ; and this conduct, with the refusal of a gift from Henry (a rare act of virtue), won him the approbation of Becket. But Becket himself was not yet without mistrust ; he had doubts whether Vivian's report to the Pope would be in the same spirit. "If it be not, he deserves the doom of the traitor Judas."

Henry at length agreed that on the question of compensation he would abide by the sentence of the court of the French King, the judgment of the Gallican Church, and of the University of Paris.<sup>1</sup> This made so favorable an impression that Becket could only evade it by declaring that he had rather come to an amicable agreement with the King than involve the affair in litigation.

At length all difficulties seemed yielding away, when Becket demanded the customary kiss of peace, as the pledge of reconciliation. Henry peremptorily refused ; he had sworn in his wrath never to grant this favor to Becket. He was inexorable ; and without this guarantee Becket would not trust the faith of the King. He was reminded, he said, by the case of the Count of Flanders, that even the kiss of peace did not secure a revolted subject, Robert de Silian, who, even after this sign of amity, had been seized and cast into a dungeon. Henry's conduct, if not the effect of sudden passion or ungovernable aversion, is inexplicable. Why did he seek this interview, which, if he was insincere in his desire for reconciliation, could afford but short delay ? and from such oaths he would hardly have refused, for any great purpose of his own,

Kiss of  
Peace.

<sup>1</sup> Epist. *ibid.* ; Radulph de Diceto.

to receive absolution.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, it is quite clear that Becket reckoned on the legatine power of William of Sens and the terror of the English prelates, who had refused to attend a council in London to reject the Interdict. He had now full confidence that he could exact his own terms and humble the King under his feet.<sup>2</sup>

But the King was resolved to wage war to the utmost. Geoffrey Ridel, Archdeacon of Canterbury, was sent to England with a royal <sup>King's proclamation.</sup> proclamation containing the following articles: — I. Whosoever shall bring into the realm any letter from the Pope or the Archbishop of Canterbury is guilty of high treason. II. Whosoever, whether bishop, clerk, or layman, shall observe the Interdict, shall be ejected from all his chattels, which are confiscate to the Crown. III. All clerks absent from England shall return before the feast of St. Hilary, on pain of forfeiture of all their revenues. IV. No appeal is to be made to the Pope or Archbishop of Canterbury under pain of imprisonment and forfeiture of all chattels. V. All laymen from beyond seas are to be searched, and if anything be found upon them contrary to the King's honor, they are to be imprisoned; the same with those who cross to the Continent. VI. If any clerk or monk shall land in England without passport from the King, or with anything contrary to his honor, he shall be thrown into prison. VII. No clerk or monk may cross the seas without the King's passport. The same rule applied to the clergy of Wales, who were to be expelled from

<sup>1</sup> According to Pope Alexander, Henry offered that his son should give the kiss of peace in his stead. — Giles, iv. 55.

<sup>2</sup> See his letter to his emissaries at Rome. — Giles, iii. 219; Bouquet, 401.

all schools in England. Lastly, VIII. The sheriffs were to administer an oath to all freemen throughout England, in open court, that they would obey these royal mandates, thus abjuring, it is said, all obedience to Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury.<sup>1</sup> The bishops, however, declined the oath; some concealed themselves in their dioceses. Becket addressed a triumphant or gratulatory letter to his suffragans on their firmness. "We are now one, except that most hapless Judas, that rotten limb (Foliot of London), which is severed from us."<sup>2</sup> Another letter is addressed to the people of England, remonstrating on their impious abjuration of their pastor, and offering absolution to all who had sworn through compulsion and repented of their oath.<sup>3</sup> The King and the Primate thus contested the realm of England.

But the Pope was not yet to be inflamed by Becket's passions, nor quite disposed to depart from his The Pope still dubious. temporizing policy. John of Oxford was at the court in Benevento with the Archdeacons of Rouen and Seez. From that court returned the Archdeacon of Llandaff and Robert de Barre with a commission to the Archbishop of Rouen and the Bishop of Nevers to make one more effort for the termination of the difficulties. On the one hand they were armed with powers, if the King did not accede to his own terms within forty days after his citation (he had offered a thousand marks as compensation for all losses), to pronounce an interdict against his continental dominions;

<sup>1</sup> Ricardus Dorubernensis apud Twysden. Lord Lyttelton has another copy, in his appendix; in that a ninth article forbade the payment of Peter's Pence to Rome; it was to be collected and brought into the exchequer.

<sup>2</sup> Epist. Giles, iii. 195; Bouquet, 404.

<sup>3</sup> Giles, iii. 192; Bouquet, 405.

on the other, Becket was exhorted to humble himself before the King ; if Henry was inflexible and declined the Pope's offered absolution from his oath, to accept the kiss of peace from the King's son. The King was urged to abolish in due time the impious and obnoxious Customs. And to these prelates was likewise intrusted authority to absolve the refractory Bishops of London and Salisbury.<sup>1</sup> This, however, was not the only object of Henry's new embassy to the Pope. He had long determined on the coronation of his eldest son ; it had been delayed for various reasons. He seized this opportunity of reviving a design which would be as well humiliating to Becket as also of great moment in case the person of the King should be struck by the thunder of excommunication. The coronation of the King of England was the undoubted prerogative of the Archbishops of Canterbury, which had never been invaded without sufficient cause, and Becket was the last man tamely to surrender so important a right of his see. John of Oxford was to exert every means (what those means were may be conjectured rather than proved) to obtain the papal permission for the Archbishop of York to officiate at that august ceremony.

The absolution of the Bishops of London and Salisbury was an astounding blow to Becket. He tried to impede it by calling in question the power of the archbishop to pronounce it without the presence of his colleague. The archbishop disregarded his remonstrance, and Becket's sentence was thus annulled by the authority of the Pope. Rumors at the same time began to spread that the Pope had granted to the Archbishop of York power to proceed to the coronation. Becket's

<sup>1</sup> Dated February 12, 1170.

fury burst all bounds. He wrote to the Cardinal Albert and to Gratian: "In the court of Rome, now as ever, Christ is crucified and Barabbas released. The miserable and blameless exiles are condemned, the sacrilegious, the homicides, the impenitent thieves are absolved, those whom Peter himself declares that in his own chair (the world protesting against it) he would have no power to absolve.<sup>1</sup> Henceforth I commit my cause to God — God alone can find a remedy. Let those appeal to Rome who triumph over the innocent and the godly, and return glorying in the ruin of the Church. For me I am ready to die." Becket's fellow-exiles addressed the Cardinal Albert, denouncing in vehement language the avarice of the court of Rome, by which they were brought to support the robbers of the Church. It is no longer King Henry alone who is guilty of this six years' persecution, but the Church of Rome.<sup>2</sup>

The coronation of the Prince by the Archbishop of York took place in the Abbey of Westminster on the 15th of June.<sup>3</sup> The assent of the clergy was given

<sup>1</sup> Epist. Giles, iii. 96; Bouquet, 416; Giles, iii. 108; Bouquet, 419. "*Sed pro eâ mori parati sumus.*" He adds: "*Insurgant qui voluerint cardinales, arment non modo regem Angliæ, sed totum, si possent orbem in perniciem nostram . . . Utinam via Romana non gratis peremisset tot miseros innocentes. Quis de cetero audebit illi regi resistere quem ecclesia Romana tot triumphis animavit, et armavit exemplo pernicioso manante ad posteros.*"

<sup>2</sup> "*Nec persuadebitur mundo, quod suasores isti Deum saperent; sed potius pecuniam, quam immoderato avaritiæ ardore sitiunt, olfecerunt.*" — Giles, iv. 291; Bouquet, 417.

<sup>3</sup> Becket's depression at this event is dwelt upon in a letter of Peter of Blois to John of Salisbury. Peter travelled from Rome to Bologna with the Papal legates. From them he gathered that either Becket would soon be reconciled to the King or be removed to another patriarchate. — Epist. xxii. apud Giles, i. p. 84.



with that of the laity. The Archbishop of York produced a papal brief, authorizing him to perform the ceremony.<sup>1</sup> An inhibitory letter, if it reached England, only came into the King's hand, and was suppressed; no one, in fact (as the production of such papal letter, as well as Becket's protest to the archbishop and to the bishops collectively and severally, was by the royal proclamation high treason or at least a misdemeanor) would dare to produce them.

The estrangement seemed now complete, the reconciliation more remote than ever. The Archbishop of Rouen and the Bishop of Nevers, though urged to immediate action by Becket and even by the Pope, admitted delay after delay, first for the voyage of the King to England, and secondly for his return to Normandy. Becket seemed more and more desperate, the King more and more resolute. Even after the Coronation, it should seem, Becket wrote to Roger of York,<sup>2</sup> to Henry of Worcester, and even to Foliot of London, to publish the Interdict in their dioceses. The latter

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Lingard holds this letter, printed by Lord Lyttelton, and which he admits was produced, to have been a forgery. If it was, it was a most audacious one; and a most flagrant insult to the Pope, whom Henry was even now endeavoring to propitiate through the Lombard Republics and the Emperor of the East (see Giles, iv. 10). It is remarkable, too, that though the Pope declares that this coronation, contrary to his prohibition (Giles, iv. 30), is not to be taken as a precedent, he has no word of the forgery. Nor do I find any contemporary assertion of its spuriousness. Becket, indeed, in his account of the last interview with the King, only mentions the general permission granted by the Pope at an early period of the reign; and argues as if this were the only permission. Is it possible that a special permission to York to act was craftily interpolated into the general permission? But the trick may have been on the side of the Pope, now granting, now nullifying his own grants by inhibition. Bouquet is strong against Baronius (as on other points) upon Alexander's duplicity. — p. 434.

<sup>2</sup> Giles, iii. 229.

was a virtual acknowledgment of the legality of his absolution, which in a long letter to the Bishop of Nevers he had contested :<sup>1</sup> but the Interdict still hung over the King and the realm ; the fidelity of the clergy was precarious.

The reconciliation at last was so sudden as to take the world by surprise. The clue to this is found in Fitz-Stephen. Some one had suggested by word or by writing to the King that the Primate would be less dangerous within than without the realm.<sup>2</sup> The hint flashed conviction on the King's mind. The two Kings had appointed an interview at Fretteville, between Chartres and Tours. The Archbishop of Sens prevailed on Becket to be, unsummoned, in the neighborhood. Some days after the King seemed persuaded by the Archbishops of Sens and Rouen and the Bishop of Nevers to hold a conference with Becket.<sup>3</sup> As soon as they drew near the King rode up, uncovered his head, and saluted the Prelate with frank courtesy, and after a short conversation between the two and the Archbishop of Sens, the King withdrew apart with Becket. Their conference was so long as to try the patience of the spectators, so familiar that it might seem there had never been discord between them. Becket took a moderate tone ; by his own account he laid the faults of the King entirely on his evil counsellors. After a gentle admonition to the King on his sins, he urged him to make restitution to the see of Canterbury. He dwelt strongly on the late

Treaty of  
Fretteville.

<sup>1</sup> Giles, iii. 302.

<sup>2</sup> " Dictum fuit aliquem dixisse vel scripsisse regi Anglorum de Archiepiscopo ut quid tenetur exclusus ? melius tenebitur inclusus quam exclusus. Satisque dictum fuit intelligenti." — p. 272.

<sup>3</sup> Giles, iv. 30 ; Bouquet, 436.

usurpation on the rights of the primacy, on the coronation of the King's son. Henry alleged the state of the kingdom and the necessity of the measure; he promised that as his son's queen, the daughter of the King of France, was also to be crowned, that ceremony should be performed by Becket, and that his son should again receive his crown from the hands of the Primate.

At the close of the interview Becket sprung from his horse and threw himself at the King's feet. The King leaped down, and holding his stirrup compelled the Primate to mount his horse again. In the most friendly terms he expressed his full reconciliation not only to Becket himself, but to the wondering and delighted multitude. There seemed an understanding on both sides to suppress all points which might lead to disagreement. The King did not dare (so Becket writes triumphantly to the Pope) to mutter one word about the Customs.<sup>1</sup> Becket was equally prudent, though he took care that his submission should be so vaguely worded as to be drawn into no dangerous concession on his part. He abstained, too, from all other perilous topics; he left undecided the amount of satisfaction to the church of Canterbury; and on July. these general terms he and the partners of his exile were formally received into the King's grace.

If the King was humiliated by this quiet and sudden reconciliation with the imperious prelate, to outward appearance at least he concealed his humiliation by his noble and kingly manner. If he submitted to

<sup>1</sup> "Nam de consuetudinibus quas tanta perviciâ vindicare consueverat nec mutire præsumpsit." Becket was as mute. The issue of the quarrel seems entirely changed. The Constitutions of Clarendon recede, the right of coronation occupies the chief place. — See the long letter, Giles, 65.

the spiritual reproof of the prelate, he condescended to receive into his favor his refractory subject. Each maintained prudent silence on all points in dispute. Henry received, but he also granted pardon. If his concession was really extorted by fear, not from policy, compassion for Becket's six years' exile might seem not without influence. If Henry did not allude to the Customs, he did not annul them; they were still the law of the land. The kiss of peace was eluded by a vague promise. Becket made a merit of not driving the King to perjury, but he skilfully avoided this trying test of the King's sincerity.

But Becket's revenge must be satisfied with other victims. If the worldly King could forget the rancor of this long animosity, it was not so easily appeased in the breast of the Christian Prelate. No doubt vengeance disguised itself to Becket's mind as the lofty and rightful assertion of spiritual authority. The opposing prelates must be at his feet, even under his feet. The first thought of his partisans was not his return to England with a generous amnesty of all wrongs, or a gentle reconciliation of the whole clergy, but the condign punishment of those who had so long been the counsellors of the King, and had so recently officiated in the coronation of his son.

The court of Rome did not refuse to enter into these views, to visit the offence of those disloyal bishops who had betrayed the interests and compromised the high principles of churchmen.<sup>1</sup> It was presumed that the King would not risk a peace so hardly gained for his

<sup>1</sup> Humbold Bishop of Ostia advised the confining the triumph to the depression of the Archbishop of York and the excommunication of the Bishops. — Giles, vi. 129; Bouquet, 443.

obsequious prelates. The lay adherents of the King, even the plunderers of Church property were spared, some ecclesiastics about his person, John of Oxford himself, escaped censure : but Pope Alexander sent the decree of suspension against the Archbishop-Dated Sept. 10. op of York, and renewed the excommunication of London and Salisbury, with whom were joined the Archdeacon of Canterbury and the Bishop of Rochester, as guilty of special violation of their allegiance to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of St. Asaph, and some others. Becket himself saw the policy of altogether separating the cause of the bishops from that of the King. He requested that some expressions relating to the King's excesses, and condemnatory of the bishops for swearing to the Customs, should be suppressed ; and the excommunication grounded entirely on their usurpation of the right of crowning the King.<sup>1</sup>

About four months elapsed between the treaty of Fretteville and the return of Becket to England. They were occupied by these negotiations at Rome, Veroli, and Ferentino ; by discussions with the King, who was attacked during this period with a dangerous illness ; and by the mission of some of Becket's officers to resume the estates of the see. Becket had two personal interviews with the King : the first Interview at Tours. was at Tours, where, as he was now in the King's dominions, he endeavored to obtain the kiss of peace. The Archbishop hoped to betray Henry into this favor during the celebration of the mass, in which it might

<sup>1</sup> "Licet ei (regi sc.) pepercieritis, dissimulare non audetis excessus et crimina sacerdotum." This letter is a curious revelation of the arrogance and subtlety of Becket. — Giles. iii. 77.



seem only a part of the service.<sup>1</sup> Henry was on his guard, and ordered the mass for the dead, in which the benediction is not pronounced. The King had received Becket fairly; they parted not without ill-concealed estrangement. At the second meeting the King seemed more friendly; he went so far as to say, "Why resist my wishes? I would place everything in your hands." Becket, in his own words, bethought him of the tempter, "All these things will I give unto thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me."

The King had written to his son in England that the see of Canterbury should be restored to Becket, as it was three months before his exile. But there were two strong parties hostile to Becket: the King's officers who held in sequestration the estates of the see, and seem to have especially coveted the receipt of the Michaelmas rents; and with these some of the fierce warrior nobles, who held lands or castles which were claimed as possessions of the Church of Canterbury. Randolph de Broc, his old inveterate enemy, was determined not to surrender his castle of Saltwood. It was reported to Becket, by Becket represented to the King, that De Broc had sworn that he would have Becket's life before he had eaten a loaf of bread in England. The castle of Rochester was held on the same doubtful title by one of his enemies. The second party was that of the bishops, which was powerful, with a considerable body both of the clergy and laity. They had sufficient influence to urge the King's officers to take the strongest measures, lest the Papal letters of excommunication should be introduced into the kingdom.

It is perhaps vain to conjecture, how far, if Becket

<sup>1</sup> It is called the Pax.

had returned to England in the spirit of meekness, forgiveness, and forbearance, not wielding the thunders of excommunication, nor determined to trample on his adversaries, and to exact the utmost even of his most doubtful rights, he might have resumed his see, and gradually won back the favor of the King, the respect and love of the whole hierarchy, and all the legitimate possessions of his church. But he came not in peace, nor was he received in peace.<sup>1</sup> It was not the Archbishop of Rouen, as he had hoped, but his old enemy John of Oxford, who was commanded by the King to accompany him, and reinstate him in his see. The King might allege that one so much in the royal confidence was the best protector of the Archbishop. The money which had been promised for his voyage was not paid; he was forced to borrow 300*l.* of the Archbishop of Rouen. He went, as he felt, or affected to feel, with death before his eyes, yet nothing should now separate him from his long-divided flock. Before his embarkation at Whitsand in Flanders, he received intelligence that the shores were watched by his enemies, it was said with designs on his life,<sup>2</sup> but assuredly with the determination of making a rigid search for the letters of excommunication.<sup>3</sup> To secure the safe carriage of one of these perilous documents, the suspension of the Archbishop of York, it was intrusted to a nun

Becket prepares for his return.

Letters of excommunication sent before him.

<sup>1</sup> Becket disclaims vengeance: "*Neque hoc dicimus, Deo teste, vindictam expetentes, quum scriptum esse noverimus, non quæres ultionem . . . sed ut ecclesia correctionis exemplo possit per Dei gratiam in posterum roborare, et pœnâ paucorum multos ædificare.*" — Giles, iii. 76.

<sup>2</sup> See Becket's account. — Giles, iii. p. 81.

<sup>3</sup> Lambeth says: "*Visum est autem nonnullis, quod incircumspectè literarum vindictâ post pacem usus est, quæ tantum pacis desperatione fuerint datæ.*" — p. 116. Compare pp. 119 and 152.

named Idonea, whom he exhorts, like another Judith, to this holy act, and promises her as her reward the remission of her sins.<sup>1</sup> Other contraband letters were conveyed across the channel by unknown hands, and were delivered to the bishops before Becket's landing.

The Prelates of York and London were at Canterbury when they received these Papal letters. When the fulminating instruments were read before them, in which was this passage, "we will fill your faces with ignominy," their countenances fell. They sent messengers to complain to Becket, that he came not in peace, but in fire and flame, trampling his brother bishops under his feet, and making their necks his footstool; that he had condemned them uncited, unheard, unjudged. "There is no peace," Becket sternly replied, "but to men of good-will."<sup>2</sup> It was said that London was disposed to humble himself before Becket; but York,<sup>3</sup> trusting in his wealth, boasted that he had in his power the Pope, the King, and all their courts.

Instead of the port of Dover, where he was expected. Becket's vessel, with the archiepiscopal banner displayed, cast anchor at Sandwich. Soon after his landing, appeared in arms the Sheriff of Kent, Randulph de Broc, and others of his enemies. They searched his baggage, fiercely demanded that he should absolve the bishops, and endeavored to force the Archdeacon of Sens, a foreign ecclesiastic, to take an oath

Lands at  
Sandwich.  
Dec. 1.

<sup>1</sup> Lord Lyttelton has drawn an inference from these words unfavorable to the purity of Idonea's former life; and certainly the examples of the Magdalene and the woman of Egypt, if this be not the case, were unhappily chosen.

<sup>2</sup> Fitz-Stephen, pp. 281, 284.

<sup>3</sup> Becket calls York his ancient enemy: "Lucifer ponens sedem suam in aquilone."

to keep the peace of the realm. John of Oxford was shocked, and repressed their violence. On his way to Canterbury the country clergy came forth with their flocks to meet him ; they strewed their garments in his way, chanting, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." Arrived at Canterbury, he <sup>At Canter-</sup> rode at once to the church with a vast pro-<sup>bury.</sup> cession of clergy, amid the ringing of the bells, and the chanting of music. He took his archiepiscopal throne, and afterwards preached on the text, "Here we have no abiding city." The next morning came again the Sheriff of Kent, with Randulph de Broc, and the messengers of the bishops, demanding their absolution.<sup>1</sup> Becket evaded the question by asserting that the Excommunication was not pronounced by him, but by his superior the Pope ; that he had no power to abrogate the sentence. This declaration was directly at issue with the bull of excommunication : if the bishops gave satisfaction to the Archbishop, he had power to act on behalf of the Pope.<sup>2</sup> But to the satisfaction which, according to one account, he did demand, that they should stand a public trial, in other words place themselves at his mercy, they would not, and hardly could submit. They set out immediately to the King in Normandy.

The restless Primate was determined to keep alive the popular fervor, enthusiastically, almost <sup>Goes to</sup> fanatically, on his side. On a pretext of a <sup>London.</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Becket accuses the bishops of thirsting for his blood ! "Let them drink it." But this was a phrase which he uses on all occasions, even to William of Pavia.

<sup>2</sup> "Si vero ita eidem Archiepiscopo et Cantuarensi Ecclesiæ satisfacere inveniretis, ut pœnam istam ipse videat relaxandam, vice nostrâ per illum volumus adimpleri." — Apud Bouquet, p. 461.

visit to the young King at Woodstock, to offer him the present of three beautiful horses, he set forth on a state-ly progress. Wherever he went he was received with acclamations and prayers for his blessings by the clergy and the people. In Rochester he was entertained by the Bishop with great ceremony. In London there was the same excitement: he was received in the palace of the Bishop of Winchester in Southwark. Even there he scattered some excommunications.<sup>1</sup> The Court took alarm, and sent orders to the prelate to return to his diocese. Becket obeyed, but alleged as the cause of his obedience, not the royal command, but his own desire to celebrate the festival of Christmas in his metropolitan church. The week passed in holding sittings in his court, where he acted with his usual promptitude, vigor, and resolution against the intruders into livings, and upon the encroachments on his estates; and in devotions most fervent, mortifications most austere.<sup>2</sup>

His rude enemies committed in the mean time all kinds of petty annoyances, which he had not the loftiness to disdain. Randolph de Broc seized a vessel laden with rich wine for his use, and imprisoned the sailors in Pevensey Castle. An order from the court compelled him to release ship and crew. They robbed the people who carried his provisions, broke into his park, hunted his deer, beat his retainers; and, at the

<sup>1</sup> "Ipse tamen Londonias adiens, et ibi missarum solenniis celebratis, quosdam excommunicavit." — *Passio*. iii. p. 154.

<sup>2</sup> Since this passage was written an excellent and elaborate paper has appeared in the *Quarterly Review*, full of local knowledge. I recognize the hand of a friend from whom great things may be expected. I find, I think, nothing in which we disagree, though that account, having more ample space, is more particular than mine. (Reprinted in *Memorials of Canterbury* by Rev. A. P. Stanley.)



instigation of Randolph's brother, Robert de Broc, a ruffian, a renegade monk, cut off the tail of one of his state horses.

On Christmas day Becket preached on the appropriate text, "Peace on earth, good-will towards men." The sermon agreed ill with the text. He spoke of one of his predecessors, St. Alphege, who had suffered martyrdom. "There may soon be a second." He then burst out into a fierce, impetuous, terrible tone, arraigned the courtiers, and closed with a fulminating excommunication against Nigel de Sackville, who had refused to give up a benefice into which, in Becket's judgment, he had intruded, and against Randolph and Robert de Broc. The maimed horse was not forgotten. He renewed in the most vehement language the censure on the bishops, dashed the candle on the pavement in token of their utter extinction, and then proceeded to the mass at the altar.<sup>1</sup>

In the mean time the excommunicated prelates had sought the King in the neighborhood of Ba-<sup>The bishops  
with the  
King.</sup>yeux; they implored his protection for themselves and the clergy of the realm. "If all are to be visited by spiritual censures," said the King, "who officiated at the coronation of my son, by the eyes of God, I am equally guilty." The whole conduct of Becket since his return was detailed, and no doubt deeply darkened by the hostility of his adversaries. All had been done with an insolent and seditious design of alienating the affections of the people from the King. Henry demanded counsel of the prelates; they declared themselves unable to give it. But one incautiously said, "So long as Thomas lives, you will never

<sup>1</sup> Fitz-Stephen, De Bosham, Grim. *in loc.*

be at peace." The King broke out into one of his terrible constitutional fits of passion ; and at length let fall the fatal words, " Have I none of my thankless and cowardly courtiers who will relieve me from the insults of one low-born and turbulent priest ? "

These words were not likely to fall unheard on the ears of fierce and warlike men, reckless of bloodshed, possessed with a strong sense of their feudal allegiance, and eager to secure to themselves the reward of desperate service. Four knights, chamberlains of the King, Reginald Fitz-Urse, William de Tracy, Hugh de Moreville, and Reginald Brito, disappeared from the court.<sup>1</sup> On the morrow, when a grave council was held, some barons are said, even there, to have advised the death of Becket. Milder measures were adopted : the Earl of Mandeville was sent off with orders to arrest the primate ; and as the disappearance of these four knights could not be unmarked, to stop them in the course of any unauthorized enterprise.

But murder travels faster than justice or mercy. They were almost already on the shores of England. It is said that they met in Saltwood Castle. On the 28th of December, having, by the aid of Randulph de Broc, collected some troops in the streets of Canterbury, they took up their quarters with Clarembold, Abbot of St. Augustine's.

The assassination of Becket has something appalling, with all its terrible circumstances seen in the remote past. What was it in its own age ? The most dis-

<sup>1</sup> See, on the former history of these knights, Quarterly Review, vol. xciii p. 355. The writer has industriously traced out all that can be known much which was rumored about these men.

tinguished churchman in Christendom, the champion of the great sacerdotal order, almost in the hour of his triumph over the most powerful king in Europe ; a man, besides the awful sanctity inherent in the person of every ecclesiastic, of most saintly holiness ; soon after the most solemn festival of the Church, in his own cathedral, not only sacrilegiously, but cruelly murdered, with every mark of hatred and insult. Becket had all the dauntlessness, none of the meekness of the martyr ; but while his dauntlessness would command boundless admiration, few, if any, would seek the more genuine sign of Christian martyrdom.

The four knights do not seem to have deliberately determined on their proceedings, or to have resolved, except in extremity, on the murder. The knights before Becket.

They entered, but unarmed, the outer chamber.<sup>1</sup> The Archbishop had just dined, and withdrawn from the hall. They were offered food, as was the usage ; they declined, thirsting, says one of the biographers, for blood. The Archbishop obeyed the summons to hear a message from the King ; they were admitted to his presence. As they entered, there was no salutation on either side, till the Primate having surveyed, perhaps recognized them, moved to them with cold courtesy. Fitz-Urse was the spokesman in the fierce altercation which ensued. Becket replied with haughty firmness. Fitz-Urse began by reproaching him with his ingratitude and seditious disloyalty in opposing the coronation of the King's son, and commanded him, in instant obedience to the King, to absolve the prelates. Becket protested that so far from wishing to diminish the

<sup>1</sup> Tuesday, Dec. 29. See, on the fatality of Tuesday in Becket's life, Q. R. p. 357.

power of the King's son, he would have given him three crowns and the most splendid realm. For the excommunicated bishops he persisted in his usual evasion that they had been suspended by the Pope, by the Pope alone could they be absolved; nor had they yet offered proper satisfaction. "It is the King's command," spake Fitz-Urse, "that you and the rest of your disloyal followers leave the kingdom."<sup>1</sup> "It becomes not the King to utter such command: henceforth no power on earth shall separate me from my flock." "You have presumed to excommunicate, without consulting the King, the King's servants and officers." "Nor will I ever spare the man who violates the canons of Rome, or the rights of the Church." "From whom do you hold your archbishopric?" "My spirituals from God and the Pope, my temporals from the King." "Do you not hold all from the King?" "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." "You speak in peril of your life!" "Come ye to murder me? I defy you, and will meet you front to front in the battle of the Lord." He added, that some among them had sworn fealty to him. At this, it is said, they grew furious, and gnashed with their teeth. The prudent John of Salisbury heard with regret this intemperate language: "Would it may end well!" Fitz-Urse shouted aloud, "In the King's name I enjoin you all, clerks and monks, to arrest this man, till the King shall have done justice on his body." They rushed out, calling for their arms.

His friends had more fear for Becket than Becket for himself. The gates were closed and barred, but pres-

<sup>1</sup> Grim, p. 71. Fitz-Stephen.

ently sounds were heard of those without, striving to break in. The lawless Randolph de Broc was hewing at the door with an axe. All around Becket was the confusion of terror: he only was calm. Again spoke John of Salisbury with his cold prudence — “Thou wilt never take counsel: they seek thy life.” “I am prepared to die.” “We who are sinners are not so weary of life.” “God’s will be done.” The sounds without grew wilder. All around him entreated Becket to seek sanctuary in the church. He refused, whether from religious reluctance that the holy place should be stained with his blood, or from the nobler motive of sparing his assassins this deep aggravation of their crime. They urged that the bell was already tolling for vespers. He seemed to give a reluctant consent; but he would not move without the dignity of his crosier carried before him. With gentle compulsion they half drew, half carried him through a private chamber, they in all the hasty agony of terror, he striving to maintain his solemn state, into the church. The din of the armed men was ringing in the cloister. The affrighted monks broke off the service; some hastened to close the doors; Becket commanded them to desist — “No one should be debarred from entering the house of God.” John of Salisbury and the rest fled and hid themselves behind the altars and in other dark places. The Archbishop might have escaped into the dark and intricate crypt, or into a chapel in the roof. There remained only the Canon Robert (of Merton), Fitz-Stephen, and the faithful Edward Grim. Becket stood between the altar of St. Benedict and that of the Virgin.<sup>1</sup> It was thought that

<sup>1</sup> For the accurate local description, see Quarterly Review, p. 367.



Becket contemplated taking his seat on his archiepiscopal throne near the high altar.

Through the open door of the cloister came rushing in The murder. the four, fully armed, some with axes in their hands, with two or three wild followers, through the dim and bewildering twilight. The knights shouted aloud, "Where is the traitor?" No answer came back. "Where is the Archbishop?" "Behold me, no traitor, but a priest of God!" Another fierce and rapid altercation followed: they demanded the absolution of the bishops, his own surrender to the King's justice. They strove to seize him and to drag him forth from the Church (even they had awe of the holy place), either to kill him without, or to carry him in bonds to the King. He clung to the pillar. In the struggle he grappled with De Tracy, and with desperate strength dashed him on the pavement. His passion rose; he called Fitz-Urse by a foul name, a pander. These were almost his last words (how unlike those of Stephen and the greater than Stephen!) He taunted Fitz-Urse with his fealty sworn to himself. "I owe no fealty but to my King!" returned the maddened soldier, and struck the first blow. Edward Grim interposed his arm, which was almost severed off. The sword struck Becket, but slightly, on the head. Becket received it in an attitude of prayer — "Lord, receive my spirit," with an ejaculation to the Saints of the Church. Blow followed blow (Tracy seems to have dealt the first mortal wound), till all, unless perhaps De Moreville, had wreaked their vengeance. The last, that of Richard de Brito, smote off a piece of his skull. Hugh of Horsea, their follower, a renegade priest surnamed Mauclerk, set his heel upon his neck, and crushed out

the blood and brains. "Away!" said the brutal ruffian, "it is time that we were gone." They rushed out to plunder the archiepiscopal palace.

The mangled body was left on the pavement; and when his affrighted followers ventured to approach to perform their last offices, an incident occurred which, however incongruous, is too characteristic to be suppressed. Amid their adoring awe at his courage and constancy, their profound sorrow for his loss, they broke out into a rapture of wonder and delight on discovering not merely that his whole body was swathed in the coarsest sackcloth, but that his lower garments were swarming with vermin. From that moment miracles began. Even the populace had before been divided; voices had been heard among the crowd denying him to be a martyr; he was but the victim of his own obstinacy.<sup>1</sup> The Archbishop of York even after this dared to preach that it was a judgment of God against Becket—that "he perished, like Pharaoh, in his pride."<sup>2</sup> But the torrent swept away at once all this resistance. The Government inhibited the miracles, but faith in miracles scorns obedience to human laws. The Passion of the Martyr Thomas was saddened and glorified every day with new incidents of its atrocity, of his holy firmness, of wonders wrought by his remains.

The horror of Becket's murder ran throughout Christendom. At first, of course, it was attributed to Henry's direct orders. Universal hatred branded the King of England with a kind of outlawry, a spontaneous excommunication. William

<sup>1</sup> Grim, 70.

<sup>2</sup> John of Salisbury. Bouquet, 619, 620.

of Sens, though the attached friend of Becket, probably does not exaggerate the public sentiment when he describes this deed as surpassing the cruelty of Herod, the perfidy of Julian, the sacrilege of the traitor Judas.<sup>1</sup>

It were injustice to King Henry not to suppose that with the dread as to the consequences of this act must have mingled some reminiscences of the gallant friend and companion of his youth and of the faithful minister, as well as religious horror at a cruel murder, so savagely and impiously executed.<sup>2</sup> He shut himself for three days in his chamber, obstinately refused all food and comfort, till his attendants began to fear for his life. He issued orders for the apprehension of the murderers,<sup>3</sup> and despatched envoys to the Pope to exculpate himself from all participation or cognizance of the crime. His ambassadors found the Pope at Tusculum: they were at first sternly refused an audience. The afflicted and indignant Pope was hardly prevailed on to permit the execrated name of the King of England to be uttered before him. The cardinals still friendly to the King with difficulty obtained knowledge of Alexander's determination. It was, on a fixed day, to pronounce with the utmost solemnity, excommunication against the King by name, and an interdict on all

<sup>1</sup> Giles, iv. 162. Bouquet, 467. It was fitting that the day after that of the Holy Innocents should be that on which should rise up this new Herod.

<sup>2</sup> See the letter of Arnulf of Lisieux. — Bouquet, 469.

<sup>3</sup> The Quarterly reviewer has the merit of tracing out the extraordinary fate of the murderers. "By a singular reciprocity, the principle for which Becket had contended, that priests should not be subjected to the secular courts, prevented the trial of a layman for the murder of a priest by any other than a clerical tribunal." Legend imposes upon them dark and romantic acts of penance; history finds them in high places of trust and honor. — pp. 377, *et seq.* I may add that John of Oxford five years after was Bishop of Norwich. Ridel too became Bishop of Ely.

his dominions, on the Continent as well as in England. The ambassadors hardly obtained the abandonment of this fearful purpose, by swearing that the King would submit in all things to the judgment of his Holiness, With difficulty the terms of reconciliation were arranged.

In the Cathedral of Avranches in Normandy, in the presence of the Cardinals Theodin of Porto, and Albert the Chancellor, Legates for that <sup>Reconciliation at Avranches.</sup> especial purpose, Henry swore on the Gospels that he had neither commanded nor desired the death of Becket; that it had caused him sorrow, not joy; he had not grieved so deeply for the death of his father or his mother.<sup>1</sup> He stipulated — I. To maintain two hundred knights at his own cost in the Holy Land. II. To abrogate the Statutes of Clarendon, and all bad customs introduced during his reign.<sup>2</sup> III. That he would reinvest the Church of Canterbury in all its rights and possessions, and pardon and restore to their estates all who had incurred his wrath in the cause of the Primate. IV. If the Pope should require it, he would himself make a crusade against the <sup>Ascension Day.</sup> Saracens in Spain. In the porch of the <sup>May 22, 1172.</sup> church he was reconciled, but with no ignominious ceremony.

Throughout the later and the darker part of Henry's reign the clergy took care to inculcate, and the people were prone enough to believe, that all his disasters and calamities, the rebellion of his wife and of his sons, were judgments of God for the persecution if not the

<sup>1</sup> Diceto, p. 557.

<sup>2</sup> This stipulation, in Henry's view, cancelled hardly any; as few, and these but trifling customs, had been admitted during his reign.

murder of the Martyr Thomas. The strong mind of Henry himself, depressed by misfortune and by the estrangement of his children, acknowledged with superstitious awe the justice of their conclusions. Heaven, the Martyr in Heaven, must be appeased by a public humiliating penance. The deeper the degradation the more valuable the atonement. In less than three years after his death the King visited the tomb of Becket, by this time a canonized saint, renowned not only throughout England for his wonder-working powers, but to the limits of Christendom. As soon as he came near enough to see the towers of Canterbury, the King dismounted from his horse, and for three miles walked with bare and bleeding feet along the flinty road. The tomb of the Saint was then in the crypt beneath the church. The King threw himself prostrate before it. The Bishop of London (Foliot) preached ; he declared to the wondering multitude that on his solemn oath the King was entirely guiltless of the murder of the Saint : but as his hasty words had been the innocent cause of the crime, he submitted in lowly obedience to the penance of the Church. The haughty monarch then prayed to be scourged by the willing monks. From the one end of the church to the other each ecclesiastic present gratified his pride, and thought that he performed his duty, by giving a few stripes.<sup>1</sup> The King passed calmly through this rude discipline, and then spent a night and a day in prayers and tears, imploring the intercession in Heaven of him whom, he thought not now on how

Penance at  
Canterbury.  
Friday,  
July 12,  
1174.

<sup>1</sup> The scene is related by all the monkish chroniclers. — Gervaise, Diceto, Brompton, Hoveden.



just grounds, he had pursued with relentless animosity on earth.<sup>1</sup>

Thus Becket obtained by his death that triumph for which he would perhaps have struggled in vain through a long life. He was now a Saint, and for some centuries the most popular Saint in England: among the people, from a generous indignation at his barbarous murder, from the fame of his austerities and his charities, no doubt from admiration of his bold resistance to the kingly power; among the clergy as the champion, the martyr of their order. Even if the clergy had had no interest in the miracles at the tomb of Becket, the high-strung faith of the people would have wrought them almost without suggestion or assistance. Cures would have been made or imagined; the latent powers of diseased or paralyzed bodies would have been quickened into action. Belief, and the fear of disbelieving, would have multiplied one extraordinary event into a hundred; fraud would be outbid by zeal; the invention of the crafty, even if what may seem invention was not more often ignorance and credulity, would be outrun by the demands of superstition. There is no calculating the extent and effects of these epidemic outbursts of passionate religion.<sup>2</sup>

Becket was indeed the martyr of the clergy, not of the Church; of sacerdotal power, not of Christianity; of a caste, not of mankind.<sup>3</sup> From Becket martyr of the clergy.

<sup>1</sup> Peter of Blois was assured by the two cardinal legates of Henry's innocence of Becket's death. See this letter, which contains a most high-flown eulogy on the transcendent virtues of Henry. — Epist. 66.

<sup>2</sup> On the effect of the death, and the immediate concourse of the people to Canterbury, Lambeth. p. 133.

<sup>3</sup> Herbert de Bosham, writing fourteen years after Becket's death, declares him among the most undisputed martyrs. "Quod alicujus martyrum

beginning to end it was a strife for the authority, the immunities, the possessions of the clergy.<sup>1</sup> The liberty of the Church was the exemption of the clergy from law; the vindication of their separate, exclusive, distinctive existence from the rest of mankind. It was a sacrifice to the deified self; not the individual self, but self as the centre and representative of a great corporation. Here and there in the long full correspondence there is some slight allusion to the miseries of the people in being deprived of the services of the exiled bishops and clergy:<sup>2</sup> "there is no one to ordain clergy, to consecrate virgins:" the confiscated property is said to be a robbery of the poor: yet in general the sole object in dispute was the absolute immunity of the clergy from civil jurisdiction,<sup>3</sup> the right of appeal from the temporal sovereign to Rome, and the asserted superiority of the spiritual rulers in every respect over the temporal power. There might, indeed, be latent advantages to mankind, social, moral, and religious, in this secluded sanctity of one class of men; it might be *causa justior fuit aut apertior ego nec audivi, nec legi.*" So completely were clerical immunities part and parcel of Christianity.

<sup>1</sup> The enemies of Becket assigned base reasons for his opposition to the King. "*Ecclesiasticam etiam libertatem, quam defensatis, non ad animarum lucrum sed ad augmentum pecuniarum, episcopos vestros intorquere.*" See the charges urged by John of Oxford. — Giles, iv. p. 188.

<sup>2</sup> Especially in Epist. 19. "Interim."

<sup>3</sup> It is not just to judge the clergy by the crimes of individual men, but there is one case, mentioned by no less an authority than John of Salisbury, too flagrant to pass over: it was in Becket's own cathedral city. Immediately after Becket's death the Bishops of Exeter and Worcester were commissioned by Pope Alexander to visit St. Augustine's, Canterbury. They report the total dilapidation of the buildings and estates. The prior elect "*Jugi, quod hereticus damnat, fluit libidine, et hinc in fœminas, adeo impudens ut libidinem, nisi quam publicaverit, voluptuosam esse non reputat.*" He debauched mothers and daughters: "*Fornicationis abusum comparat necessitati.*" In one village he had seventeen bastards. — Epist. 310.

well that there should be a barrier against the fierce and ruffian violence of kings and barons ; that somewhere freedom should find a voice, and some protest be made against the despotism of arms, especially in a newly-conquered country like England, where the kingly and aristocratic power was still foreign : above all, that there should be a caste, not an hereditary one, into which ability might force its way up, from the most low-born, even from the servile rank ; but the liberties of the Church, as they were called, were but the establishment of one tyranny — a milder, perhaps, but not less rapacious tyranny — instead of another ; a tyranny which aspired to uncontrolled, irresponsible rule, nor was above the inevitable evil produced on rulers as well as on subjects, from the consciousness of arbitrary and autocratic power.

Reflective posterity may perhaps consider as not the least remarkable point in this lofty and tragic strife that it was but a strife for power. Verdict of posterity.

Henry II. was a sovereign who, with many noble and kingly qualities, lived, more than even most monarchs of his age, in direct violation of every Christian precept of justice, humanity, conjugal fidelity. He was lustful, cruel, treacherous, arbitrary. But throughout this contest there is no remonstrance whatever from Primate or Pope against his disobedience to the laws of God, only to those of the Church. Becket *might*, indeed, if he had retained his full and acknowledged religious power, have rebuked the vices, protected the subjects, interceded for the victims of the King's unbridled passions. It must be acknowledged by all that he did not take the wisest course to secure this which might have been beneficent influence. But as to what appears, if

the King would have consented to allow the churchmen to despise all law — if he had not insisted on hanging priests guilty of homicide as freely as laymen — he might have gone on unreprieved in his career of ambition; he might unrebuked have seduced or ravished the wives and daughters of his nobles; extorted without remonstrance of the Clergy any revenue from his subjects, if he had kept his hands from the treasures of the Church. Henry's real tyranny was not (would it in any case have been?) the object of the churchman's censure, oppugnancy, or resistance. The cruel and ambitious and rapacious King would doubtless have lived unexcommunicated and died with plenary absolution.

## CHAPTER IX.

ALEXANDER III. AND THE POPES TO THE CLOSE OF THE  
TWELFTH CENTURY.

THE history of Becket has been throughout almost its whole course that of Pope Alexander III.: it has shown the Pontiff as an exile in France, and after his return to Rome. The support of the English Primate, more or less courageous and resolute, or wavering and lukewarm, has been in exact measure to his own prosperity and danger. When Alexander seems to abandon the cause of the English Primate, he is trembling before his own adversaries, or embarrassed with increasing difficulties; when he boldly, either through himself or his legates, takes part against the King of England, it is because he feels strong enough to stand without the countenance or without the large pecuniary aids lavished by Henry.

Alexander remained in France above three years. During that time the kingdom of Sicily was <sup>April, 1162,</sup> restored to peace and order; the Emperor <sup>to Sept.</sup> 1165. had returned to Germany, where he seemed likely to be fully occupied with domestic wars; the Italian republics were groaning under the oppressive yoke of their conqueror, which they were watching the opportunity to throw off: Milan, given up to ruin, fire, and, most destructive of all, to the fury of her enemies,



razed to the earth, if not sown with salt. Lodi, Cremona, Pavia, had risen from her ashes ; but walls had grown up, trenches sunk around the condemned city. Her old allies had rivalled in zeal, activity, and devotion her revengeful foes. Her scattered citizens had returned. The Archbishop's palace towered in its majesty, the churches lifted up their pinnacles and spires, the republic had resumed its haughtiness, its turbulence.<sup>1</sup> The Antipope Victor was dead,<sup>2</sup> but a new Antipope was not wanting. The Emperor might, without loss of honor, have made peace with Alexander ; but the Imperialist churchmen dared not trust a Pope whom they had denied to be Pope. The Archbishop of Cologne and the German and Lombard prelates proclaimed Guido of Crema by the title of Paschal III. ; he was consecrated by the Bishop of Liege. But the Antipope had not dared to contest Rome ; he was, in fact, a German Antipope overawed by German prelates. In Rome the vicegerent of Pope Alexander ruled with almost undisturbed sway ; but in that vicegerent had taken place an important change. Julius, the Cardinal of Palestrina, died ; the Cardinal of St. John and St. Paul was appointed in his place. This Cardinal was a man of great address and activity. By artful language and well-directed bribery, notwithstanding all the opposition of Christian, the Chancellor of the Empire, he won over the versatile people : the senate were entirely at his disposal.

The Pope, at the summons of his Vicar, and lavishly

<sup>1</sup> Ann. 1162. On the extent of the destruction of Milan, and its restoration, compare Verri, *Storia di Milano*, c. vii. He gives the authorities in full.

<sup>2</sup> April 1164. In Lucca.

supplied with money by the Kings of France and England, embarked, on the octave of the Assumption of the Virgin, at Marseilles, himself Sept. 1165. Alexander embarks for Italy. in one vessel, the cardinals of his party and Oberto, the anti-Imperialist Archbishop of Milan, in another. They were watched by the fleet of Pisa, in the interests of the Emperor. The vessel which conveyed the cardinals was taken, searched in vain for the person of the Pope, and then released; that with the Pope on board put back into the port. Shortly Early in November. after in a smaller and swift-sailing bark he reached Messina: there he received a splendid embassy from the King of Sicily; several large vessels were placed at his command. The Archbishop of Reggio (in Calabria) and many barons of Southern Italy joined themselves to the cardinals around him. The fleet landed at Ostia: the clergy and senators Nov. 22. of Rome crowded to pay their homage to the Pope. He was escorted to the city by numbers bearing olive-branches. At the Lateran gate the clergy in their sacred vestments, the authorities of the city and the militia under their banners, the Jews with Nov. 24. their Bible in their hands, presented themselves; and in the midst of this festive procession he took possession of the Lateran palace.

But it was not the policy of the Hohenstaufen Emperor to desert the cause of his Antipope, and to leave Alexander in secure possession of Rome. After the Pope had occupied Rome for a year, in the following year Frederick crossed the Alps with a great force. Rainald, Archbishop of Cologne and Archchancellor of Italy, preceded his march towards the A.D. 1167. south. Pisa received him: the Alexandrine archbishop,

Villani, was degraded, Benencasa installed as archbishop.<sup>1</sup> Rome was notoriously the prize of the highest bidder; it had been bought by Alexander with the gold of France, England, and Sicily;<sup>2</sup> many were disposed to be bought again by the Emperor. Rainald of Cologne, an active, daring, and unscrupulous partisan, made great progress in the neighborhood of Rome and in Rome itself in favor of the Antipope. The Emperor, at the head of his army, moved slowly southwards. Instead, however, of marching direct to Rome, he sat down before Ancona, which had returned or been resubdued to its allegiance to the Byzantine Empire; for the Byzantine Manuel Comnenus had found leisure to mingle himself again in the affairs of Italy; he even aspired to reunite Rome to what the Byzantines still called the Roman Empire.<sup>3</sup> Ancona made a brave resistance, and the Imperial forces were thus diverted from the capital.

The feeble Romans were constant to one passion alone, the hatred of their neighbors; that hatred was now centred on Tusculum. Notwithstanding all the remonstrances of the more prudent Pope, the whole militia of Rome, on whom depended the power of re-

<sup>1</sup> "Quem venerabilis Pasqualis cum cancellario, et cardinalibus gloriose recepit." — Marangoni, p. 47.

<sup>2</sup> "Roma si invenerit emptorem, venalem se præberet." — Vit. Alex. III.

<sup>3</sup> Cinnamus, vi. 4, p. 261, ed. Bonn. According to the Byzantine, the Pope had agreed to this. Ἐς τὸ πάλαι ἔθος ἀνακεχωρηκέναι τοῦ ἐν Ρώμῃ ἀρχιερέως συνομολογήσαντος. Alexander was well content to accept Greek gold, not Greek rule. Did Manuel fondly believe his sincerity? In 1171 (Feb. 28), Alexander, alarmed at a proposition of marriage between the son of the Emperor Frederick and the daughter of the King of France, offers to the King of France to procure for his daughter the hand of the son of the Byzantine emperor, "whose treasury is inexhaustible." "Sanè apud imperatorem (Constantinopolitanum) regnum et consanguinei puellæ ærarium indeficiens semper invenient." — Apud Bouquet, xv. 901.

sistance to the Emperor, marched out to attack the detested neighbor. They suffered a disgraceful defeat by a few German troops, headed by the Archbishop of Mentz, their general, and the garrison of Tusculum under the command of the Archbishop of Cologne. Their loss was great and irreparable, 1000 slain, 2000 prisoners: the prowess of these warlike churchmen afflicted even to tears but did not subdue the courage of the resolute Pontiff.<sup>1</sup> He strengthened as far as he could the fortifications of Rome; a few troops were obtained from the Queen Regent of Sicily (William II. was now dead) and the youthful king. Frederick had broken up the siege of Ancona; he reached Rome, and easily got possession of the Leonine city; the Vatican alone maintained an obstinate defence, till some of the buildings caught fire and compelled the garrison to capitulate. The Antipope took possession of St. Peter's, reeking with blood up to the high altar,<sup>2</sup> and performed the papal functions. The Emperor attended; the Empress Beatrice received the imperial diadem, and the crown of Frederick was blessed again by the Pontiff.

Alexander seemed at first determined to defend to the utmost the city on the other side of the Tiber. Some Sicilian vessels had sailed up the river to bring supplies of money and to convey him away. Alexander refused to embark. The Frangipanis and the house of Peter Leonis were firm and united in his

<sup>1</sup> "Paucissimi evaserunt, qui non occisi, aut captivati fuerint." — *Chronicon Reichsperg*. The best account of the victory of these martial prelates is in *Otto de Saint Blaise*, c. xx.

<sup>2</sup> *Otto de Saint Blaise*. He says that the imperial troops hewed down the gates of Saint Peter's with axes and hatchets, and fought their way to the high altar, slaying as they went. — Compare *Marangoni*, p. 48.

cause. Before long he thought it more prudent to escape in disguise to Gaeta; there he resumed the pontifical attire and withdrew to Benevento.

Rome consoled herself for her enforced submission by the reëstablishment of her senate in supreme authority. The Emperor endeavored, by the grant of various immunities, to secure the fidelity of the people; but the Frangipanis, the Peter Leonis, and many of the nobles, remained aloof in sullen silence, and kept within their impregnable fortress palaces. But the Pope had a more powerful ally. Never did the climate of Rome so fearfully humiliate the pride of the Emperor, or work with such awful force for the liberation of Italy.<sup>1</sup> No wonder that the visible hand of God was seen in the epidemic which broke out in the German army. It seemed, as has been said, commissioned with especial violence against those rebellious churchmen who had taken part and stood in arms against the lawful Pope. The Archbishop elect of Cologne, the Bishops of Prague, Liege, Spire, Ratibon, Verdun, Augsburg, Zeitz, were among its first victims. With them perished Duke Frederick of Swabia, the young Duke Guelf, in whom expired the line of the Estensian Guelfs. The pestilence was no less terrific from its rapidity than from its intensity. Men were, in perfect health in the morning, dead before the evening: it was hardly possible to perform the rites of decent burial. The Emperor broke up his camp in the

<sup>1</sup> Here perhaps may once more be cited Peter Damiani's lines, almost equally appropriate on every German invasion:

"Roma vorax hominum, domat ardua colla virorum,  
Roma ferax febrium, necis est uberrima frugum,  
Romanæ febres stabili sunt jure fideles." — c. lxiii.



utmost haste, retreated, not without hostile resistance in the pass of Pontremoli, by Lucca and Pisa Retreat of Barbarossa. Sept. 4, 1167. to Pavia. Of nobles, bishops, knights, and squires, not reckoning the common soldiers, he had lost 2000 by the plague and during his retreat. Nor was this the worst: all Lombardy was in arms. A league had been formed to throw off his tyrannical yoke by Venice, Verona and all her dependencies, Vicenza, Padua, Treviso, Ferrara, Brescia, Bergamo, Cremona, Milan, Lodi, Piacenza, Parma, Mantua, Modena, and Bologna. The Emperor was not safe in Pavia: early in the spring of the next year the haughty Barbarossa hardly found his way to Germany in disguise; A.D. 1168. with greater difficulty the wreck of his army stole through the passes of the Alps.<sup>1</sup>

With the flight of the Emperor fell the cause of the Antipope. City after city declared its allegiance to Alexander. The Antipope maintained himself in St. Peter's, but his death in the autumn of the Sept. 20, 1168. year might have been expected to terminate the schism. No single cardinal of his faction remained; but the obstinate few who adhered to him persuaded John, formerly Abbot of Struma, now Bishop of Tusculum, to assume the papacy under the name of Calixtus III. His legates were received by Frederick at a great Diet at Bamberg; yet the June 23, 1169. 1170. Emperor did not scruple during the following year to send Eberhard, the Bishop of Bamberg, to negotiate with Alexander, now avowedly the head of the Lombard League. The great fortress which had been

<sup>1</sup> "Sicque evadens Imperator, transcursis Alpibus, exercitum, morte, morbo, omnique miseriâ confectum, in patriam reduxit." — Otto de Saint Blaise, c. xx.

erected in the plains of Piedmont, as the impregnable place of arms for the League, was named after the Pope, Alexandria. The Pontiff was too sagacious not to perceive that the object of these peaceful offers was to alienate him from his allies, the King of Sicily, the Emperor of Constantinople, and the Lombard cities. The Pope received Eberhard of Bamberg at Veroli;<sup>1</sup> as the Bishop had no authority to acknowledge him unreservedly as Pope, he was dismissed with haughty courtesy. Yet Alexander dared not to take up his abode in Rome. The Prefect still commanded there in the name of the Emperor; and Tusculum, hard pressed by the Romans, whom the Prefect could not but indulge in their hope of vengeance for their late defeat, surrendered first to the Prefect, afterwards to the Pope as the mightier protector. To increase the confusion, Manuel the Eastern Emperor pressed more vigorously his intrigues to regain a footing in Italy. He condescended to court the Frangipani by granting his daughter in marriage to a prince of that powerful house. The Pope, still at Veroli, gave his blessing to the nuptials. A.D. 1172. Rome now offered her unqualified allegiance to the Pope at the price of the sacrifice of Tusculum,<sup>2</sup> which had yielded herself into his hands, and where he had held his papal state more than two years. Alexander consented to raze her impregnable walls; his treachery to Tusculum was punished by the treachery of the Romans. When the walls of her hated rival were levelled they laughed to scorn their own agreement. Alexander retired to Anagni, revenging him-

<sup>1</sup> Alexander was at Veroli from March to September.

<sup>2</sup> His bulls bear date at Tusculum, from Oct. 17, 1170, to Jan. 1173. — Jaffé, *Regesta*.

self by fortifying again the denuded city of Tusculum.<sup>1</sup>

It was not till above three years after, when the pride of Barbarossa had been humbled by his total defeat at Legnano, the battle-field in May 29, 1176.  
Defeat of  
Legnano. which the Lombard republics won their independence, that Alexander could trust the earnest wishes of the Emperor for peace. The Emperor could no longer refuse to recognize a pontiff at the head of the League of his conquerors; it was of awful omen that the fortress named after the Pope had borne before the fatal battle all the brunt of the war, and defied his mightiest armament. A secret treaty, now that a treaty was necessary for both parties, arranged the chief Nov. 12. points in dispute between the Pope and the Emperor; the general pacification was not publicly proclaimed till the following year.

Then the Pope, under the safe-conduct of the Emperor, embarked with his retinue in eleven stately galleys, for Venice. He was received with the highest honors by the Doge, Sebastiano Ziani,<sup>2</sup> and the senators. Some dispute took place as to the city in which was to be holden the general congress; the Lombards proposed Bologna; the Emperor Venice; and Venice was at length agreed upon by all parties. But though the terms of reconciliation between the Pope and the Emperor might be arranged with no great difficulty, and on their main points had been settled before at Anagni (the full recognition of Alexander — the abandonment of the Antipope, was the one important article), more embarrassing

<sup>1</sup> He was at Segni, Jan, 27, 1173; at Anagni, March 28.

<sup>2</sup> He embarked at Viesti, March 9, 1177.

questions arose on the terms insisted on by the Pope's allies, especially the Lombard republics. The Emperor demanded the full acknowledgment of all the imperial rights recognized at the diet of Roncaglia, and claimed or enjoyed by his predecessors. The republics insisted on the confirmation of their customs as recognized by the late emperors, Henry V., Conrad, and Lothair.

Truce of Venice. As peace seemed impracticable, the Pope at length suggested a truce. The Emperor at first indignantly rejected this proposition, but was prevailed on to yield to a truce of six years with the Lombard League; of fifteen with the King of Sicily. In the mean time the Emperor was to retain possession of the domains of the Countess Matilda; after that they were to revert to the Pope. The Lombards bitterly complained of this abandonment of their cause; they had borne the brunt and expenditure of the war; the Pope only consulted his own advantage. But Alexander judged more wisely of their real interests. The cities during the truce were more likely to increase in wealth and power, might quietly strengthen their fortifications, and gather the resources of war; the Emperor, in that time, might be involved in new hostilities in Germany. At all events the Christian prelate might fully determine to obtain a suspension of arms, if he could not a permanent peace: the chances of peace were better for all parties than those of war.

The Emperor then advanced towards Venice. When he arrived at Chioggia, the eager and tumultuous populace were disposed to transport him into the city, without precaution or exchange of hostages. The distrustful Pope was so alarmed, that he kept his galleys prepared for flight. The Lombard deputies actually

set out towards Treviso. But the grave wisdom of the Doge Ziani, and of the senate, appeased the popular movement, arranged and guaranteed the ceremonial for the proclamation of the peace on the meeting of the Pope and of the Emperor.

On Tuesday the 24th of July, the Pope went in great state to the Church of St. Mark: the Doge, with the Bucentaur, and other splendid galleys, to meet the Emperor at S. Niccolo del Lido.<sup>1</sup> The bishops of Ostia, Porto, and Palestrina, with other cardinals, were sent forward to absolve the Emperor and his adherents from the ban of excommunication. The warlike Archbishop of Mentz, and the other German prelates, abjured the Antipopes, Octavian, Guido of Crema, and John of Struma. The Emperor, with the Doge and senators, and with his own Teutonic nobles, advanced to the portal of St. Mark's, where stood the Pope in

<sup>1</sup> Daru alone, of modern historians, adheres to the old fables, as old as the fourteenth century, of the march of Frederick towards Anagni; the flight of the Pope in disguise to Venice, where he was recognized; Frederick's pursuit to Tarento; the defeat of his great fleet of seventeen large galleys by the Venetians, and the capture of his son Otho; finally, the Pope's insolent behavior to the Emperor, his placing his feet upon his neck, with the words, "*Super aspida et basiliscum ponam pedes nostros*;" Frederick's indignant reply, "*Non tibi, sed Petro.*" The account appears in a passage of Dandolo (in Chron.) of questioned authenticity, which appeals to, but does not cite, earlier Venetian histories. But the total silence and the irreconcilable accounts of the contemporary historians and of the Papal letters must outweigh these dubious authorities. A more powerful, but, from his Venetian patriotism, less impartial, advocate than Daru, Paolo Sarpi, had before maintained the same views. Yet such a fiction is extraordinary. Venetian pride might invent the part which redounds to the glory of Venice: but who invented the striking interview between the Emperor and the Pope? It is not an improbable suggestion, that it originated in paintings, representing the Pope and the Emperor in such attitudes. The paintings are by Spinello, a Siennese, of which city Alexander III. was a native. Compare the vivid description of these frescoes, Lord Lindsay, *Hist. of Christian Art*, ii. 315. Spinello painted in the latter half of the fourteenth century. As Poetry has so often become, here Painting for once became History.



his pontifical attire. Frederick no sooner beheld the successor of St. Peter, than he threw off his imperial mantle, prostrated himself, and kissed the feet of the Pontiff. Alexander, not without tears, raised him up, and gave him the kiss of peace. Then swelled out the *Te Deum*; and the Emperor, holding the hand of the Pope, was led into the choir, and received the papal benediction. From thence they proceeded together to the Ducal Palace.<sup>1</sup> The next day, the feast of St. James the Apostle, the Pope celebrated mass, and preached to the people. The Emperor held his stirrup when he departed from the church; but the courtesy of the Pope prevented him from holding the bridle along the Place of St. Mark. At a great council held in the church, the Pope excommunicated all who should infringe the treaty.

Thus Venice might seem to have the glory of mediating a peace, which at least suspended for some years all the horrors of war — the war which, throughout Italy, had arrayed city against city, on the Papal or Imperialist factions.<sup>2</sup> They had assisted in terminating a disastrous schism which had distracted Christendom for so many years.

<sup>1</sup> A curious passage from a newly-recovered poem, if poem it may be called, by Godfrey of Viterbo, an attendant on the Emperor, gives an incident worth notice. So great was the press in the market that the aged Pope was thrown down: —

“ Jam Papa perisset in arto,  
Cæsar ibi vetulum ni relevasset eum.”

This is an odd contrast of real life with romance. — Apud Pertz, Archiv. iv. p. 363.

<sup>2</sup> Muratori has given the list. On the Emperor's side were Cremona (Pisa?), Pavia, Genoa, Tortona, Asti, Albi, Aequa, Turin, Ventimiglia, Savona, Albengo, Casale, Montevro, Castel Bolognese, Imola, Faenza, Ravenna, Forlì, Forlimpopoli, Cesena, Rimini, the Marquises of Montferrat, Guast, and Bosco, the Counts of Blandrate and Lomello. In the League, Venice, Treviso, Padua, Vicenza, Verona, Brescia, Ferrara, Mantua, Ber-

Even Rome was overawed by the unity between the Emperor and the Pope. The city sent seven of her nobles to entreat Alexander to honor Rome with his presence. After some negotiation a treaty was agreed on. The senate continued to subsist, but swore fealty and rendered homage to the Pope; the Church of St. Peter, and the royalties seized by the people, were restored. Alexander took possession of the Lateran palace, and celebrated Easter with great pomp. April 9, 1178. In the August of the same year the Antipope, Calixtus III., abdicated his vain title. He had fled to Viterbo, determined to maintain a vigorous resistance; he received a message from the Emperor, threatening him, if he refused to submit, with the ban of the Empire. He fled on to Montalbano; he was received by John, the lord of that castle, whose design, it is said, was to sell him at a high price to Alexander. In Montalbano he was besieged by the Archbishop of Mentz, who wasted all the territory around.<sup>1</sup> Calixtus, in despair, threw himself on the mercy of his enemy; he went to Tusculum, fell at the feet of Alexander, confessed his sin of schism, and implored forgiveness. Alexander received him with Christian gentleness, and Aug. 29, 1178. even advanced him afterwards to a post of dignity — the government of the city of Benevento.

gamo, Lodi, Milan, Como, Novara, Vercelli, Alexandria, Carsino and Belmonte, Piacenza, Bobbio, the Marquis Malespina, Parma, Reggio, Modena, Bologna, Dozza, San Cassiano, &c.

<sup>1</sup> This fierce prelate, whom in the Treaty of Venice Pope Alexander had recognized as rightful Archbishop of Mentz, was afterwards involved in a quarrel with the Marquis of Montferrat concerning the possession of Viterbo. The people were for the archbishop, and the Pope, Lucius III., now his ally; the nobles for Conrad, son of the Marquis. The archbishop was taken and kept for some time in iron chains. He ransomed himself at a great price, fought many more battles, and died at length of a fever. — Muratori, 1179.

A great council in the Lateran was the last important act in the long and eventful pontificate of Alexander.<sup>1</sup> He died in Civita Castellana.

Thus closed the first act of the great tragedy, the strife of the Popes with the imperial house of Hohenstaufen. The Pope had gained a signal victory; he had won back the now uncontested papacy, and the city of Rome. He was at the head of a mighty Italian interest, both in the South and in the North, Sicily and the Lombard League. Yet though humbled, Barbarossa was still of formidable power; he had subdued, driven into exile his one dangerous German subject, the rebel Henry the Lion. Many cities, and some of the most powerful, were firmly attached to the imperial cause, the more firmly from their internecine hatred each to some other of the cities of the League; the proverbial animosity of Guelf and Ghibelline had begun to rage. Till towards the close of this century the Papacy might seem to be in quiet repose, gathering its strength for the great culminating manifestation of its power in Innocent III.

Five Popes,<sup>2</sup> neither distinguished by their personal

<sup>1</sup> This Council, among other acts, regulated the election of the Pope (Romuald-Salernit): he must have two thirds of the suffrages. It enacted sumptuary laws as to the horses of prelates on their visitation; hawks and hounds and costly banquets were prohibited; the Knights-Templars and Hospitallers were to be under episcopal authority: clerks to have no women in their houses. There were Canons on the house of God; in favor of lepers; against Christians furnishing arms to Saracens; against wreckers; against Jews and Saracens having Christian slaves. Cathari, Paterines, Publicans were anathematized.

<sup>2</sup> Lucius III., inaugurated Nov. 1181 . . . 1185  
 Urban III. " . . . 1185 . . . 1187  
 Gregory VIII. " . . . 1187 . . . 1187  
 Clement III. " . . . 1187 . . . 1190  
 Cœlestine III. " . . . 1190 Jan. 1198

character, nor by the events of their pontificate, passed in succession, during less than twenty years, over the scene. Of these Popes two alone honored Rome by their residence. The three first can hardly be called Bishops of Rome.

On the death of Alexander he was succeeded by a native of Lucca, Ubaldo, Bishop of Ostia and Sept. 1, 1181. Velletri. Lucius III. (this was his pontifical name) retained his residence, probably his bishopric of Velletri. Rome, rarely visited by Alexander, for six months endured the presence of her new pontiff.<sup>1</sup> Then Rome was again in rebellion: the Pope at Velletri, afterwards at Anagni. The cruelty and insolence of the Romans was at its height. They blinded six-and-twenty Tusculan prisoners, and set cardinal's hats on their heads; a wretch with one eye left was crowned with the papal tiara, inscribed "Lucius III., the worthless, the deceiver." In this plight they were ordered to present themselves to the Pope in Anagni.<sup>2</sup>

The Pope and the Emperor, and the north of Italy, were still at peace. Even Alexandria had opened her gates, and for a short time took the name of Cesarea. The famous treaty of Constance seemed to fix the relations of the Emperor and the Lombard republics on a lasting ground. At Verona met the Emperor and the Pope in apparent amity. Frederick had A.D. 1183. hopes that the Pope would consent to permit him to devolve the imperial crown upon his son. Lucius had the address to suggest that a second emperor could not be crowned till the reigning emperor had

<sup>1</sup> September, 1181, March, 1182.

<sup>2</sup> Chron. Foss nov.

actually abdicated the empire. They parted in mutual mistrust ; but the Pope remained at Verona.<sup>1</sup> Lucius III. had fulminated an anathema against the sects which were now spreading in the north of Italy, and were all included under the hated name of Manicheans, the Cathari, the Paterines, the Umiliati, the poor men of Lyons, the Passagini, the Giuseppini ; he had visited with the like censures the Arnoldists and rebels of Rome. The Emperor left the papal thunders to their own unaided effects ; he moved no troops ; he would not break the peace of Italy, either to persecute the heretics, or to subdue Rome.

The cardinals, like the Pope, had abandoned the south for the north of Italy. On the death of Lucius, Nov. 25, 1185. of Lucius, Uberto, or Humbert Crivelli, his successor, Urban III., elected by twenty-seven cardinals,<sup>2</sup> retained the archbishopric of Milan (thus holding at once the two great sees of Italy) ; he chiefly resided at Verona. The peace of Venice had seemed but precarious during the pontificate of Lucius. Uberto Crivelli, the Archbishop of Milan, and full of Milanese as well as papal jealousy of the Emperor, was not likely to smooth away the causes of animosity. Urban the Turbulent (Turbanus), such was the ill-omened name which he received from his enemies, was more the republican Archbishop (in that character he had already, even in war, been among the most dangerous enemies of Barbarossa) than the supreme Pontiff. There were three fatal points in dispute, each sufficient to break up so hasty a treaty ; to estrange powers who had such little sympathy with each other. In Germany

<sup>1</sup> He was at Verona from July 25 to his death in 1185.

<sup>2</sup> Ciacconius gives their names. — Vit. Pontif.



Frederick was accused of seizing the estates of vacant sees, confiscating all the movable property, <sup>Causes of</sup> and even compelling the alienation of farms, <sup>enmity.</sup> lands, towns, and other rights; of suppressing monasteries, especially of nuns, under the pretext that they had sunk into license and irregularity. In Italy the great question of succession to the territories of the Countess Matilda had been only adjourned; the longer the Emperor maintained the possession, the less disposed was he to fulfil his covenant for the restoration of these wealthy domains to the Roman see. The third and most dangerous controversy concerned the coronation of his son, if not as Emperor, as King of Italy. The Emperor had made with success a master-stroke of policy; he had obtained the hand of Constantia, the heiress of the kingdom of Sicily, for his son and heir Henry. The kingdom of Sicily was thus, instead of a place of refuge for the Pope against the Emperor, now an imperial territory; the King, instead of a vassal holding his realm as an acknowledged fief of the papacy, the Pope's implacable antagonist. The Pope was placed, at Rome, between two fires. Urban III. strove in vain against the perilous marriage; he resolutely refused the coronation of Henry with the iron crown of Italy: this was his function as Archbishop of Milan. The office was assumed by the Bishop of Aquileia. The conduct of the ferocious Henry, the son and heir of Barbarossa, the husband of the Sicilian Constantia, aggravated the terrors of beholding the crown of Sicily on the brows of a Hohenstaufen. While yet in Lombardy, he demanded of a bishop of whom he held the investiture of his see. "Of the Pope alone," three times replied the resolute ecclesiastic. Henry ordered his attendants to

seize, to beat, and to roll in the mire the obstinate prelate. In the south he entered into an alliance with the rebel senate of Rome. A servant of the Pope, on the way from Rome with a large sum of money, was seized by his command, stripped of his treasures, and sent empty-handed, and with his nose cut off, to the Pope. The Emperor took measures, if not of equal ferocity, of more menacing hostility. He commanded the passes of the Alps to be occupied, to prevent all communication of the German ecclesiastics with the Pope; who was all this time holding his court, it might be supposed, in the midst of the Emperor's Italian territory in Verona. He commanded the Archbishop of Cologne, the Pope's legate, to assume complete ecclesiastical supremacy, and to decide all causes without the cognizance of the Pope.<sup>1</sup> At a full diet at Gelnhausen, Barbarossa arraigned the Pope, as having refused to crown his son; as having excommunicated the bishops who at the Emperor's command had officiated at that ceremony; of consecrating Fulmar Archbishop of Treves, without the approbation of the Emperor. Fulmar was finally expelled; Rudolf, the Emperor's partisan, consecrated Archbishop of Treves. Frederick disposed at his will of the German sees. The German bishops were called upon to aid their Emperor in his resistance to this contumacious Pope.

<sup>1</sup> Urban III. writes to Wickman, Archbishop of Magdeburg, to use his good offices to soothe the Emperor. "*Commonitam frequenter a sese imperialis culminis altitudinem ut ecclesie Romanæ restitueret possessiones, quas detineret occupatas, non eâ qua debuerat serenitate respondisse, nec videri velle perficere, per quod inter ecclesiam et imperium firma possit pax et concordia evenire.*" — Feb. 24, 1187. This from almost the immediate successor of Alexander III., the antecessor only by ten years of Innocent III., and from such a man as the turbulent Urban. It was a great stroke of policy to make Lombard Popes.

They offered their mediation ; they signed and sealed a document, imploring the Pope in these perilous times not to renew the old fatal wars ; they urged him at least to politic dissimulation ; at the same time they represented the exactions of his legates, and complained of the contributions levied by his officers on the monasteries in Germany, some of which had been reduced to penury. Urban III. at length determined on the excommunication of Frederick ; but the citizens of Verona declared that no such act of hostility should take place within their walls.

Urban departed to Ferrara ; for this act of resistance on the part of Verona was of evil augury, as Sept., Oct. to the indisposition of his only remaining allies, the Lombard republics, to risk their growing opulence in his cause. At Ferrara he died. Of his death there is an account by one who solemnly protests to the truth of his statement — he was an eye-witness. Peter of Blois rode with the Pope from Verona towards Ferrara. Peter endeavored to appease the deadly hatred which had been instilled into the soul of Urban against Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury. The Pope, red with anger, broke out, “ May I never dismount this horse and mount another, if I do not depose him ! ” He had hardly spoken, when the cross borne before him was dashed in pieces. It was hastily tied together. At the next town Urban fell ill : he never again mounted a horse.<sup>1</sup> He was conveyed slowly by water to Ferrara. Through Christendom it was re-

<sup>1</sup> See the very curious letter of Peter of Blois. Peter says that he had been at school with Urban at Marlborough (Maldebyrig) and was also Baldwin's *commensalis*. — Epist. 216. Giles, ii. p. 165. On Baldwin's quarrel with the monks, see Collier, i. p. 393.

ported that the cause of his hatred against the English Prelate was this : Baldwin of Canterbury had set up a chapter of secular canons against the unruly monks of Canterbury ; the monks appealed to Rome, and had inflamed the Pope with implacable resentment against Baldwin.

The peace of European Christendom was owing less to the respect for recent treaties, to either satiety of ambition in the contending parties, or the seeming isolation of the Pope, than to the calamities in the East. The rise of the great Saladin had appalled, it had even extorted generous admiration from the chivalrous kings of the West. But when Jerusalem fell before the Saracen, the loss afflicted all Christendom with grief and shame ; at one blow all the glories of the Crusades were levelled to the dust. The war was to begin anew, and if with a nobler enemy, and one more worthy to conflict with European kings — with an enemy more formidable — one unconquered, it might seem unconquerable. Urban hardly retired to Ferrara, and died of grief, it was said (though the news could not possibly have reached Italy), for this disaster.<sup>1</sup>

But Urban knew not that this disaster would save the papacy from its imminent peril ; it diverted at once even Barbarossa himself from his hostile plans ; it awed the most implacable enemies in Christendom to peace and amity. The first act of Gregory VIII.<sup>2</sup> (Albert, Cardinal of St. Lorenzo in Lucina) was to issue lamentable letters to the whole of Christendom. They described in harrowing terms the fall of Jerusalem.

<sup>1</sup> Urban left Verona in September ; Jerusalem fell on the 2d October ; Urban died on the 20th.

<sup>2</sup> Gregory, consecrated Oct. 25, 1187. The letters are dated Oct. 29.

Saladin (for the cross of Christ had ceased to be the unconquerable defence of the Christians) had overthrown the whole Christian host ; had broken into the holy city ; the cross itself was taken, the Bishop slain, the King a prisoner, many knights of the Temple and of St. John beheaded. This was the Divine visitation for the sins, not of the kingdom of Jerusalem, but of Christendom : it might melt the hearts, not only of all believers, but of mankind. The Pope exhorted all men to take arms, or at least to offer the amplest contributions for the relief of their imperilled brethren, and the recovery of the city, the sepulchre, the cross of the Lord. He appointed a fast for five years, to appease the wrath of God. Every Friday in the year was to be observed as Lent ; on Wednesdays and Saturdays meat was forbidden. To these days of abstinence the Pope and the cardinals were to add Monday. The cardinals imposed on themselves even more exemplary duties : to take the cross, to go to the Holy Land as mendicant pilgrims, to receive no presents from those who came on business to the papal court ; not to mount on horseback, but to go on foot so long as the ground on which the Saviour walked was trodden by the feet of the unbeliever.<sup>1</sup> Gregory set off for Pisa to reconcile the hostile republics of Pisa and Genoa, in order that their mighty armaments might combine Dec. 17, 1187. for the reconquest of Palestine. But Gregory died before he had completed the second month of his pontificate.

His successor, elected two days after his decease, was by birth a Roman, Paul Cardinal of Pal- Clement III.  
Dec. 19. estrina : he took the Roman name of Clem-

<sup>1</sup> Hoveden.



ent III. The pontificate was rescued from the immediate influence of the northern republics, and, as a Roman, Clement had the natural ambition to restore the Papacy to Rome. Rome herself had now again grown weary of that republican freedom which was bought at the cost of her wealth, her importance, her magnificence. Rome inhabited by the Pope was the centre of the civilized world; as an independent republic, only an inheritor of a barren name and of unproductive glory. Yet must the Pope purchase his restoration by the sacrifice of Tusculum and of Tivoli; to a Roman perhaps no heartfelt sacrifice. Tivoli had become an object of jealousy, as Tusculum formerly of implacable hatred. On these terms Clement III. obtained not  
A.D. 1188. merely his safe return to Rome, but the restoration of the Papal royalties from the Roman people. The republic by this treaty recognized the sovereignty of the Pope; the patriciate was abolished, a prefect named with more limited powers. The senators were to be annually elected, to receive the approbation and swear allegiance to the Pope. St. Peter's Church and all its domains were restored to the Pope; of the tolls  
March, 1191. which were levied one third was to be expended for the use of the Roman people. The senate and people were to respect the majesty and maintain the honor and dignity of the Roman Pontiff; the Roman Pontiff to bestow the accustomed largesses on the senators, their judges, and officers.<sup>1</sup> Clement III. ruled in peace for two years; he died in Rome.

Hyacinth, Cardinal of St. Maria in Cosmedin, was  
April 15. elected to the Papacy; he took the name of  
Cœlestine III. Cœlestine III. His first act must be the

<sup>1</sup> The treaty in Baronius and Muratori. *Antiq. Ital. Dissert.* 32.

coronation of the Emperor Henry. Since the loss of Jerusalem the new Crusade had absorbed the mind of Europe. Of all these expeditions none had commenced with greater pomp, and it might seem security of victory. Notwithstanding the prowess of Saladin, could he resist the combined forces, the personal ability and valor of the three greatest monarchs of Europe? Barbarossa himself had yielded to the irresistible enthusiasm; at the head of such an army as might become the great Cæsar of the West, he had set forth by land to Palestine. The Kings of France and of England, Philip Augustus, Richard the Lion-hearted, proceeded by sea. But, if possible, this Crusade was even more disastrous, achieved less and suffered more, than all before. The Emperor Frederick was drowned in a small river of Pisidia; his vast host wasted away, and part only, and that in miserable plight, reached Antioch. The jealousies of Philip Augustus of France and Richard of England made the success of their great army impossible. Philip Augustus left the fame of an accomplished traitor, Richard that of ungovernable pride and cruelty, as well as of unrivalled valor. His chivalrous courage had won the respect of Saladin, his ruthless massacres made his name the terror, for a long time, of Saracen mothers; but no permanent conquest was made; the kingdom of Jerusalem was left to sink into a barren title. Richard's short career of glory ended in his long imprisonment in Austria.

The news of Frederick's death had reached Italy before the decease of Clement III. His successor dared not refuse the coronation of Henry, now A.D. 1189. Lord of Germany and of Sicily. Fiction at times be-

comes history. It is as important to know what men were believed to do, as what they actually did. The account of Henry's coronation, in an ancient chronicler, cannot but be false in many of its most striking particulars, as being utterly inconsistent, at least with the situation if not with the character of the Coronation of the Emperor Henry. Pope, no less than with the haughty and unscrupulous demeanor of Henry. The Pope may have beheld with secret satisfaction the seizure of the Sicilian kingdom by Tancred the Norman, the progress made by his arms in the kingdom of Naples, the ill-concealed aversion of the whole realm to the Germans; he may have looked forward to the time when a new Norman kingdom, detached from the imperial alliance, might afford security to the Roman Pontiff. But Henry was still with his unbroken forces; the husband of the Queen of Naples; there was no power at hand to protect the Pope. Cœlestine could as yet reckon on no more than the precarious support of the Romans. Henry, when he appeared with his Empress and his army in the neighborhood of Rome, might, in his eager desire to secure his coronation, quietly smile at the presumptuous bearing of the Romans, who manned their walls, and though they would admit the Emperor, refused to open their gates to his German troops; he might condescend to enter alone, and to meet the Pope on the steps of St. Peter's. But the haughty and insulting conduct attributed to Pope Cœlestine only shows what Europe, to a great extent, believed to be the relation in which the Popes supposed themselves to stand towards the Emperor; the wide-spread opinion of the supremacy which they claimed, and which they exercised on all practicable occasions. "Cœles-

tine sat on his pontifical throne, holding the imperial crown between his feet; the Emperor and Empress bowed their heads, and from between the feet of the Pope received each the crown. But the Lord Pope immediately struck the crown of the Emperor with his foot and cast it to the ground, signifying that if he should deserve it, it was in the Pope's power to degrade him from the empire. The cardinals caught up the fallen crown and replaced it on the brow of the Emperor." Such was the notion of an English historian,<sup>1</sup> such in England was proclaimed to be the treatment of the Emperor by the Pope at this solemn time; it was received perhaps more readily, and repeated more emphatically on account of the deep hatred felt by the English nation to the ruling Emperor for his treachery to their captive sovereign King Richard.

Yet for his coronation Henry scrupled not to pay a price even more humiliating, but of which he felt not the humiliation, an act of his characteristic perfidy and cruelty. The Pope had not been able to fulfil that one of the terms of his treaty with the Roman people, which was to them of the deepest interest, the demolition of Tusculum. The city had admitted an imperial garrison to protect it from the Pope, and from Rome. The Pope demanded its surrender; without this concession he would not proceed to the corona-  
Surrender of  
Tusculum.  
A.D. 1191.  
tion. The garrison received orders, without consulting the citizens, to open the gates to the Romans. The Romans hastened to glut the vengeance of years, unchecked by Emperor or by Pope. They massacred many of the principal citizens, and mutilated the rest;

<sup>1</sup> Roger Hoveden. The passage is quoted with manifest satisfaction, as of undoubted authority, by Cardinal Baronius.

hardly one escaped without the loss of his eyes, his feet, his hands, or some other limb.<sup>1</sup> The walls were levelled to the ground, the citadel razed. Tusculum, the rival, at times the master, the tyrant of Rome, has at length disappeared. The Pope has abandoned the city, which at times enabled him to bridle the unruly populace of Rome; the Emperor one of his strongholds against the Pope himself.

Cœlestine III. during the rest of his pontificate maintained the high Christian ground, not indeed of mediator between the rivals for the kingdom of Apulia, but as protector of the distressed, the deliverer of the captive. Tancred, Count of Lecce, had been raised by the influence of the chancellor, Matthew of Salerno, to the throne of Sicily; the whole island had trembled at the chancellor's admonitions on the dangers of submission to a foreign yoke. Tancred, undisputed sovereign of Sicily, made rapid progress in the conquest of the kingdom of Naples. The Emperor, Henry, after some successes, had been baffled by the obstinate resistance of Naples; sickness had weakened his forces; he was obliged to retire to Germany. He had intrusted his Queen Constantia to the inhabitants of Salerno, who had won his confidence by loud protestations of loyalty. But there was a strong Norman party in Salerno; Constantia was delivered as a prisoner into the hands of Tancred. Cœlestine interposed. The influence of the Pope, the generous chivalry of his own disposition, or perhaps the fear that the pres-

<sup>1</sup> "Hi acceptâ legatione Imperatoris incautam civitatem Romanis traderunt qui multos peremerunt de civibus, et fere omnes sive pedibus, sive manibus, seu aliis membris mutilaverunt. Pro qua re Imperatori impropertum est multis." — Urspergen. in Chron. Sicardus Cremonen. in Chron. apud Murator. Script. Ital. vol. vii.



ence and misfortunes of Constantia might awaken the sympathy of his own subjects, induced Tancred to send her to the Emperor, not merely without ransom but loaded with magnificent presents.

For another prisoner was implored the interposition of the Pope. King Richard of England had been seized, on his return from the Holy Land, <sup>Imprisonment of King Richard.</sup> by his deadly enemy Duke Leopold of Austria. The Emperor had compelled or bribed his surrender: he was now in a dungeon of the castle of Trefels. No sooner had the news of his capture reached his own dominions than the Archbishop of Rouen wrote to complain of this outrage against a King and a crusader, who as a crusader was under the special protection of the Holy See — “Unsheathe at once, most merciful father, the sword of St. Peter; show at once your debt of gratitude to such a son of the Church, that even those of lower rank may know what succor they may expect from you in their hour of necessity.” Peter of Blois, the Archdeacon of Bath, whose high reputation for letters justified the step, addressed a letter to the Archbishop of Mentz, requiring his good offices and those of the whole German clergy for the deliverance of the King. He scrupled not, in his zeal, to compare the Duke of Austria and the Emperor himself to Judas Iscariot, who sold the Lord, and as deserving the fate of Judas.<sup>1</sup> Eleanor the Queen Mother ad- <sup>Letters of Queen Eleanor.</sup> dressed the Pope, letter after letter, in the most vehement and impassioned language<sup>2</sup> — “On thee will

<sup>1</sup> Petri Blesensis, Epist. 64.

<sup>2</sup> Petri Blesensis, Epist. 143, 144, 145, 146. These letters were written, it should seem, by Peter of Blois, with his usual force, his occasional felicity, occasional pedantry of scriptural illustration, his play upon words. “Nobis in germanâ Germaniâ hæc mala germinant universis. Legati nobis jam

fall all the guilt of this tragedy: thou who art the father of orphans, the judge of widows, the comforter of those that mourn and weep, the city of refuge to all. If the Church of Rome sits silent with folded hands at such an outrage against Christ, let God arise and judge our cause. . . . Where is the zeal of Elijah against Ahab? the zeal of John against Herod? the zeal of Ambrose against Valens? the zeal of Alexander III., whom we have heard and seen awfully cutting off Frederick the father of this Prince from the communion of the faithful?" The supplication, the expostulations, became more and more bitter. "For trifling causes your cardinals are sent in all their power even to the most barbarous regions; in this arduous, in this lamentable, in this common cause, you have not appointed even a subdeacon or an acolyth. It is lucre which in our day commissions legates, not respect for Christ, not the honor of the Church, not the peace of kingdoms, not the salvation of the people. . . . You would not much have debased the dignity of the Roman See, if in your own person you had set out to Germany for the deliverance of so great a King. Restore me my son; O man of God, if thou art indeed a man of God, not a man of blood! if thou art so lukewarm in his deliverance, the Most High may require his blood at thy hands." She dwells on the great services of the Kings of England, of Henry II. to the See of Rome: his influence had retained the King of France in fidelity to Alexander; his wealth had bought the obedience of the Romans. In a second, in a third letter, she is more pressing, more pathetic — "Can your

*testes promissi sunt, nec sunt missi: utque verum fatear, ligati potius quam legati."*

soul be safe while you do not earnestly endeavor the deliverance of your son, the sheep of your fold, by frequent legations, by wholesome admonitions, by the thunders of commination, by general interdicts, by awful excommunications? You ought to lay down your life for him in whose behalf you are unwilling to speak or to write a single word." Cœlestine was unmoved by entreaties, remonstrances, rebukes. The promised legates never presented themselves so long as Richard was in prison.<sup>1</sup> It appears not whether from prudence or fear, but no sooner was the King released, than Cœlestine embraced his cause with ardor: he demanded the restitution of the ransom, the deliverance of the hostages. He excommunicated Duke Leopold of Austria and all who had been concerned in the imprisonment of Richard. The Duke of Austria, at length, being in danger of his life by a fall from his horse, was glad to purchase his release from the excommunication by obedience to the Pope's demands.

By the death of Tancred King of Sicily, and of Roger the heir of Tancred (he died, it was said, of grief for the loss of his son), and the rapid reconquest of Apulia, and even of Sicily itself, by the Emperor Henry, the Empire had again consolidated its strength. The realm of the Hohenstaufens extended from the Mediterranean to the Baltic. It might seem that the coming century, instead of beholding the Pope, after years of obstinate strife with the house of Swabia, at the culminating point of his power, and seeing the last blood of the Hohenstaufens flow upon the scaffold, might behold him sunk into a vassal of the Emperor. It might seem that, enclosed and cooped in on

<sup>1</sup> Richard imprisoned, Dec. 20, 1192; released, Feb. 1194.

every side, holding even spiritual communications with Christendom only by the permission of the German, the Pontiff might perhaps be compelled to yield up all the haughty pretensions of the Church under long, weary, irremediable, degrading oppression. Powers which he dared not wield, or wielded in vain, would fall into contempt; the Emperor would create Popes according to his own will, and Popes so created, having lost their independence, would lose their self-respect and the respect of mankind.

But Henry himself, by the curse which, without penetrating into the divine counsels, he may be supposed to have entailed on his race by his atrocious cruelties in Italy, by the universal execration which he brought on the German name and the Ghibelline cause, by tyranny which, after much allowance for the exaggeration of hate, is too strongly, too generally attested, contributed more, perhaps, than has been generally supposed, to the sudden growth of the Papal power.

Henry appeared in Italy: Pisa and Genoa forgot their hostilities to join their fleets in his support. Pope Cœlestine bowed before the storm. Though Henry had neither restored the English gold nor the hostages, though he still retained possession of the lands of the Countess Matilda, and was virtually under excommunication as participant in the guilt of Richard's captivity, the Pope ventured on no measure of resistance, and Henry passed contemptuously by Rome to his southern prey. The Apulian cities opened their gates; Salerno only, in the desperation of fear for her treachery to the Empress, made some resistance, and suffered accordingly.<sup>1</sup> Henry

The Emperor Henry in Italy.

<sup>1</sup> The eloquent Hugo Falcandus saw the coming ruin. "Intueri mihi

marched without further opposition from the Garigliano to the Straits of Messina, from Messina to Palermo. Palermo received him with open gates, with clouds of incense and joyous processions. The youthful William, the second son of Tancred, laid his crown at the feet of the Emperor, and received the hereditary Countship of Lecce.

The campaign began in August; the Emperor celebrated Christmas in Palermo A.D. 1194. There had been no sound of arms, no disturbance, except from the jealousy of the Pisans and Genoese: not a drop of blood had been shed. At Christmas, the period of peace and festivity, Henry laid before a great assembly of the realm letters (it was said forged)<sup>1</sup> but letters which even if they did not reveal, were declared to reveal, an extensive conspiracy against his power. Bishops, nobles, the royal family, were implicated in the charges. No further evidence was offered or required. Peter de Celano sat as supreme justiciary, a man dear to the hard and ruthless heart of Henry. A judicial massacre began. Archbishops and bishops, counts and nobles — among them three sons of the Chancellor Matthew, Margantone the great naval captain, the Archbishop of Salerno — were apprehended, condemned, executed, or mutilated with

*Cruelties of  
Henry.*

jam videor turbulentas barbarorum acies; et quo feruntur impetu irruentes, civitates opulentas, et loca diuturnâ pace florentia metu concutere, cæde vastare, rapinis atterere et fœdare luxuriâ. . . . Nec enim aut rationis ordine regi, aut miseratione deflecti, aut religione terreri Teutonica novit insania, quam et innatus furor exagitat et rapacitas stimulat et libido præcipitat. . . . Væ tibi fons celebris et præclari nominis Arethusa, quæ ad hanc devoluta es miseriam, ut quæ poetarum solebas carmina modulari, nunc Teutonicorum ebrietatem mitiges, et eorum servias fœditati." — *Apud Murator. vii. p. 251.*

<sup>1</sup> "Literas fictitias et mendosas." — *Anon. Casin.* Such were the Germans in Sicily. The French were to come!



barbarous variety of torture. Some were hanged, some buried alive, some burned; blinding and castration were the mildest punishments. The bodies of Tancred and his son were torn from their graves, the crowns plucked from their usurping brows. The Queen Sybilla, with her three daughters Aleria, Constantia, and Mardonia, were thrown into prison; the Dec. 26, 1194. young William blinded and mutilated.<sup>1</sup> On the very day when these fatal disclosures were made, and the work of blood began, the Empress Constantia gave birth at Jesi to Frederick Roger, afterwards the Emperor Frederick II. The Nemesis of Grecian tragedy might be imagined as presiding over the birth.

The Pope, in righteous indignation at these inhumanities, took courage, and issued the edict of excommunication against the Emperor. Excommunication, if reserved for such crimes, might have wrought more powerfully on the minds of men. But Henry was strong enough to treat such censures with disdain: he passed through Italy without condescending to notice Rome. As he passed he distributed to his faithful German followers territories, provinces, princedoms. Markwald obtained Ancona, Ravenna, and Romagna. Diephold had large lands in Apulia; at a later period he became Count of Ancona. Richard the Count of that city, the brother-in-law of Tancred, having been seized as a traitor, bound to the tail of a horse, dragged through the streets of Capua, was hung up by the leg, till the Emperor's fool, after two

<sup>1</sup> The cruelties of Henry are darkly told, but not overcharged, in a recent work, Cherrier, *Lutte des Papes et des Empereurs de la Maison de Suabe*, Paris, 1846. See, too, Von Raumer, *Geschichte der Hohenstaufen*, b. vi. c. iii.

days' misery, put an end to his pain by tying a great stone to his neck. Philip, the Emperor's brother, had the domains of the Countess Matilda and all Tuscany. Philip married Irene, daughter of the Byzantine Emperor and widow of King Roger of Sicily. Not yet thirty years old, Henry VI., the Hohenstaufen, absolute master of Germany and of Italy, was at a greater height of power than had been attained by his father Barbarossa, or was subsequently reached by Frederick II. He could defy another Lombard League which was forming to control him; the feuds in Germany broke not out into open war. His proposition to make the Empire hereditary in his family, on the attractive condition that he should guarantee the hereditary descent of the great fiefs, and abandon all claims on the estates of the Church, was heard with favor, A.D. 1195.

and accepted by fifty-two princes of the empire. The great ecclesiastics were not indisposed to the measure; even the Pope hesitated, and only on mature deliberation declared himself opposed to the plan. But the election of his son Frederick as King of the A.D. 1196.

Romans was acceded to by his brothers, by all the princes, and won the reluctant consent of Albert Archbishop of Mentz. His popularity in Germany was increased by his earnest support of a new crusade, to which the death of Saladin and the feuds among his sons might give some reasonable hopes of success. Henry did not venture to withdraw his own personal presence from his European dominions; but he was liberal in his influence, in his levies, and in his contributions to the holy cause. The only op-Queen Constance.position to Henry's despotism was that of the gentler Empress, who tempered by every means in

her power the inhuman tyranny which still crushed her Sicilian subjects to the earth. So distasteful was her mildness, it was rumored abroad, that it gave rise to serious dissensions between the husband and the wife, that she had even meditated an insurrection in favor of her depressed people, and the transfer of her kingdom and of her hand to some less tyrannic sovereign. But these were doubtless the fictions of those who hoped they might be true: there was no outward breach; nothing seemed to disturb the conjugal harmony.

Henry returned to his Italian dominions, to suppress in his own person all that threatened insurrection, or which might by its strength be tempted to insurrection. He levelled the walls of Capua and Naples. He crossed to Sicily, and sat down before the insignificant castle of St. John, the chieftain of which had been driven into rebellion by the fear of being treated as a rebel. On a hot autumn day he went out to hunt in the neighboring forest, drank copiously of cold water, and exposed himself to the chill dews of the evening. A fever came on; he was with difficulty removed to Messina, and died in the arms of his wife. His son Frederick had not yet completed his second year. As soon as the Pope could be prevailed on to remove the excommunication, Henry VI. was buried in great state at Palermo.<sup>1</sup> Three months after Cœlestine III. followed him to the grave.<sup>2</sup> An infant was the heir of the Empire; Innocent III., in the prime of life, was Pope.

Death of  
Henry.

<sup>1</sup> Henry died Sept. 28, 1197.

<sup>2</sup> Cœlestine died Jan. 8, 1198.



## BOOK IX.

## INNOCENT III.



## CHAPTER I.

## ROME AND ITALY.

UNDER Innocent III., the Papal power rose to its utmost height. Later Pontiffs, more especially Boniface VIII., were more exorbitant in their pretensions, more violent in their measures; but the full sovereignty of the Popedom had already taken possession of the minds of the Popes themselves, and had been submitted to by great part of Christendom. The thirteenth century is nearly commensurate with this supremacy of the Pope. Innocent III. at its commencement calmly exercised as his right, and handed down strengthened and almost irresistible to his successors, that which, at its close, Boniface asserted with repulsive and ill-timed arrogance, endangered, undermined, and shook to its base. At least from the days of Hildebrand, the mind of Europe had become familiarized with the assertion of those claims, which in their latent significance amounted to an absolute irresponsible autoeracy. The essential inherent supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal power, as of the soul over the body, as of eternity over time, as of Christ



over Cæsar, as of God over man, was now an integral part of Christianity. There was a shuddering sense of impiety in all resistance to this ever-present rule; it required either the utmost strength of mind, desperate courage, or desperate recklessness, to confront the fatal and undefined consequences of such resistance. The assertion of these powers by the Church had been, however intermittingly, yet constantly growing, and had now fully grown into determinate acts. The Popes had not merely claimed, they had established many precedents of their right to excommunicate sovereigns, and so of virtually releasing subjects from their allegiance to a king under sentence of outlawry; to call sovereigns to account not merely for flagrant outrages on the Church, but for moral delinquencies,<sup>1</sup> especially those connected with marriage and concubinage; to receive kingdoms by the cession of their sovereigns as feudal fiefs; to grant kingdoms which had no legitimate lord, or of which the lordship was doubtful and contested, or such as were conquered from infidels, barbarians, or heretics: as to the Empire, to interfere in the election as judge both in the first and last resort. Ideas obtain authority and dominion, not altogether from their intrinsic truth, but rather from their constant asseveration, especially when they fall in with the common hopes and fears, the wants and necessities of hu-

<sup>1</sup> Innocent III. lays this down broadly and distinctly: "*Cum enim non humanæ constitutioni sed divinæ potius innitatur: quia potestas nostra non ex homine sed ex Deo; nullus qui sit sanæ mentis ignorat, quin ad officium nostrum spectet de quocunque mortali peccato corrigere quemlibet Christianum, et si correctionem contempserit, ipsum per distractionem ecclesiasticam coercere.*" — Decret. Innocent III., sub ann. 1200, cap. 13, de Judiciis. Eichhorn observes on this: "*Womit denn natürlich der Grundsatz selbst, das die Kirche wegen Sündlichkeit der Handlung über jede Civilsache erkennen möge, anerkannt wurde.*" — Rechts Geschichte, ii. 517.

man nature. The mass of mankind have neither leisure nor ability to examine them ; they fatigue, and so compel the world into their acceptance ; more particularly if it is the duty, the passion, and the interest of one great associated body to perpetuate them, while it is neither the peculiar function, nor the manifest advantage of any large class or order to refute them. The Pope had, throughout the strife, an organized body of allies in the camp of the enemy ; the King or Emperor none, at least none below the nobles, who would not have preferred the triumph of the spiritual power. If these ideas are favored by ambiguity of language, their progress is more sure, their extirpation from the mind of man infinitely more difficult. The Latin clergy had been busy for many centuries in asserting, under the specious name of their liberty, the supremacy of the Church which was their own supremacy ; for several centuries in asserting the autocracy of the Pope as Head of the Church. This, which was true, at least on the acknowledged principles of the time, in a certain degree, was easily extended to its utmost limits ; and when it had become part of the habitual belief, it required some palpable abuse, some startling oppugnancy to the common sense of mankind, to awaken suspicion, to rouse the mind to the consideration of its groundwork, and to decompose the splendid fallacy.

Splendid indeed it was, as harmonizing with man's natural sentiment of order. The unity of the vast Christian republic was an imposing conception, which, even now that history has shown its hopeless impossibility, still infatuates lofty minds ; its impossibility, since it demands for its Head not merely that infallibility in doctrine so boldly claimed in later times, but

absolute impeccability in every one of its possessors ; more than impeccability, an all-commanding, indefeasible, unquestionable majesty of virtue, holiness, and wisdom. Without this it is a baseless tyranny, a senseless usurpation. In those days it struck in with the whole feudal system, which was one of strict gradation and subordination ; to the hierarchy of Church and State was equally wanting the Crown, the Sovereign Liege Lord.<sup>1</sup>

When this idea was first promulgated in all its naked sternness by Gregory VII., it had come into collision with other ideas rooted with almost equal depth in the mind of man, that especially of the illimitable Cæsa-rean power, which though transferred to a German Emperor, was still a powerful tradition, and derived great weight from its descent from Charlemagne. But the imperial power, from its elective character ; from the strife and intrigue at each successive election ; from constant contests for the imperial crown ; from the opposition of mighty houses, one or two of which were almost always nearly equal in wealth and influence to the Emperor ; from the weaknesses, vices, tyrannies of the Emperors themselves, had been more and more impaired ; that of the Pope, notwithstanding transient obscurations, had been silently ascending to still higher estimation. The humiliation of the Emperor was degradation ; it brought contempt on the office, scarcely

<sup>1</sup> A letter of Innocent to the Consuls of Milan declares that it is sacrilege to doubt the decrees of a Pope ; that though he is born of sinners, of a sinful race, yet, since he fills the place of him that was without sin, he who despises him despises Christ. The cause of dispute was the excommunication of Passaguerra, against which the Milanese protested as unjust. Compare the *Decretalia*, ii. and iii., on the superiority of the priesthood to the temporal power.

redeemed by the abilities, successes, or even virtues of new Sovereigns ; the humiliation of the Pope was a noble suffering in the cause of God and truth, the depression of patient holiness under worldly violence. In every schism the Pope who maintained the loftiest Churchmanship had eventually gained the superiority, the Imperializing Popes had sunk into impotence, obscurity, ignominy.

The Crusades had made the Pope not merely the spiritual, but in some sort the military suzerain of Europe ; he had the power of summoning all Christendom to his banner ; the raising the cross, the standard of the Pope, was throughout Europe a general and compulsory levy, the herr-ban of all who bore arms, of all who could follow an army. That which was a noble act of devotion had become a duty : not to assume the cross was sin and impiety. The Crusades thus became a kind of forlorn-hope upon which all the more dangerous and refractory of the temporal sovereigns might be employed, so as to waste their strength, if not lose their lives, by the accidents of the journey or by the sword of the Mohammedan. If they resisted, the fearful excommunication hung over them, and was ratified by the fears and by the wavering allegiance of their subjects. If they obeyed and returned, as most of them did, with shame and defeat, they returned shorn of their power, lowered in the public estimation, and perhaps still pursued, on account of their ill success, with the inexorable interdict. It was thus by trammelling their adversaries with vows which they could not decline, and from which they could not extricate themselves ; by thus consuming their wealth and resources on this wild and remote warfare, that the Popes, who

themselves decently eluded, or were prevented by age or alleged occupations from embarkation in these adventurous expeditions, broke and wasted away the power and influence of the Emperors. Conrad the first Hohenstaufen had betrayed prudent reluctance to march away from distracted Germany to the Holy Land. St. Bernard sternly demanded how he would answer at the great day of Judgment, the dereliction of this more manifest duty. The trembling Emperor acknowledged the voice of God, girt on the cross, collected the strength of the Empire, to leave their whitening bones on the plains and in the defiles of Asia Minor; he returned to Europe discomfited and fallen in the estimation of all Christendom. Frederick Barbarossa, the greatest of the Swabian house, had perished in the zenith of his power, in a small remote river in Asia Minor. During this century will appear Frederick II., probably in his heart, at least during his riper years, disdaining the enthusiasm with which the dominant feeling of the time forced him to comply, excommunicated for not taking the cross, excommunicated for not setting out to the Holy Land, excommunicated for setting out, excommunicated in the Holy Land, excommunicated for returning after having made an advantageous peace with the Mohammedans. During his whole reign he is vainly struggling to burst the fetters thus wound around him, and riveted not merely by the remorseless hostility of his spiritual antagonists, but by the irresistible sentiment of the age. On this subject there was no assumption, no abuse of Papal authority, which was not ratified by the trembling assent of Christendom. The Crusades, too, had now made the Western world tributary to the Popedom; the vast subventions raised



for the Holy Land were to a certain extent at the disposal of the Pope. The taxation of the clergy on his authority could not be refused for such an object; a tenth of all the exorbitant wealth of the hierarchy passed through his hands. An immense financial system grew up; Papal collectors were in every land, Papal bankers in every capital, to transmit these subsidies. The enormous increase of his power from this source may be conjectured; the abuses of that power, the emoluments for dispensation from vows, and other evils, will appear in the course of our history.

But after all, none of these accessory and, in some degree, fortuitous aids could have raised the Papal authority to its commanding height,<sup>1</sup> had it not possessed more sublime and more lawful claims to the reverence of mankind. It was still an assertion of eternal principles of justice, righteousness, and humanity. However it might trample on all justice, sacrifice righteousness to its own interests, plunge Europe in desolating wars, perpetuate strife in states, set sons in arms against their fathers, fathers against sons; it was still proclaiming a higher ultimate end. It was some-

<sup>1</sup> It may be well to state the chief points which the Pope claimed as his exclusive prerogative:—

I. General supremacy of jurisdiction; a claim, it is obvious, absolutely illimitable.

II. Right of legislation, including the summoning and presiding in Councils.

III. Judgment in all ecclesiastic causes arduous and difficult. This included the power of judging on contested elections, and degrading bishops. a super-metropolitan power.

IV. Right of confirmation of bishops and metropolitans, the gift of the pallium. Hence, by degrees, rights of appointment to devolved sees, reservations, &c.

V. Dispensations.

VI. The foundation of new orders.

VII. Canonization.

Compare Eichhorn, ii. p. 500.

thing that there was a tribunal of appeal, before which the lawless kings, the lawless feudal aristocracy trembled, however that tribunal might be proverbial for its venality and corruption, and constantly warped in its judgments by worldly interests. There was a perpetual provocation, as it were, to the Gospel, which gave hope where it did not give succor ; which might, and frequently did, offer a refuge against overwhelming tyranny ; something, which in itself rebuked rugged force, and inspired some restraint on heinous immorality.

The Papal language, the language of the clergy, was still ostentatiously, profoundly religious ; it professed, even if itself did not always respect, even though it tampered with, the awful sense of retribution before an all-knowing, all-righteous God. In his highest pride, the Pope was still the servant of the servants of God ; in all his cruelty he boasted of his kindness to the transgressor ; every contumacious Emperor was a disobedient son ; the excommunication was the voice of a parent, who affected at least reluctance to chastise. Every Pope declared, no doubt he imagined, himself the vicar and representative of Christ, and it was impossible that all the darkness which had gathered around the perfect humanity, the God in man as revealed in the Gospel, could entirely obscure all its exquisite truth, holiness, and love.

If this great Idea was ever to be realized of a Christian republic with a Pope at its head — and Innocent III. that a Pope of a high Christian character (in some respects, in all perhaps but one, in tolerance and gentleness almost impossible in his days, and the want of which, far from impairing, confirmed his strength) —

none could bring more lofty, more various qualifications for its accomplishment, none could fall on more favorable times than Innocent III. Innocent was an Italian of noble birth, but not of a family inextricably involved in the petty quarrels and interests of the Princesdoms of Romagna. He was of the Conti,<sup>1</sup> who derived their name in some remote time from their dignity. His father, Count Trasimondo of Segna (the name Trasimondo was traced to the Lombard Dukes of Spoleto, if truly, it implied Teutonic blood), married Claricia, of the senatorial house of Scotti. He was a Roman, therefore, by the mother's side, probably of a kindred attached to the liberties of the city. Lothair was the youngest of four brothers, born at Anagni. He had high ecclesiastical connections, both on his father's and his mother's side. John, the famous Cardinal of St. Mark, was his paternal uncle. Paul, the Cardinal Bishop of Palestrina, by the title of St. Sergius and St. Bacchus, afterwards Pope Clement III., probably his uncle on his mother's side. The Cardinal Octavian, the firmest, ablest, and most intrepid supporter of Alexander III., was of his kindred. All these were of the high anti-Imperialist faction. The Education. early education of Lothair, at Rome, was completed by some years of study at Paris, the great school of theology; and at Bologna, that of law. He returned to Rome with the highest character for erudition and for irreproachable manners; he became a Canon of St. Peter's. The elevation of his uncle, the Cardinal of St. Sergius and St. Bacchus, to the Pontif-

<sup>1</sup> The Conti family boasted of nine Popes, — among them Innocent III., Gregory IX., Alexander IV., Innocent XIII.; of thirteen cardinals, according to Ciacconius.

icate as Clement III., paved the way to his rapid rise. He was elevated in his twenty-ninth year to Cardinalate. the Cardinalate under the title vacated by his uncle. Already he was esteemed among the ablest and most judicious counsellors of the supreme pontiff. The successor of Clement III., Cœlestine III., was of the house of Orsini, between whom and the maternal ancestors of Lothair, the Scotti, to whom Clement III. his patron belonged, was an ancient, unreconciled feud. Cœlestine III.,<sup>1</sup> very much advanced in years, might suspect the nepotism of his predecessor, which had raised his kinsman to such almost unprecedented rank, and had intrusted him with affairs so far beyond his years. During Cœlestine's Popedom, the Cardinal Lothair either withdrew or was silently repelled from the prominent place which he had filled under the Pontificate of Clement. In his retirement he began to despise the ungrateful world, and wrote his treatise on "Contempt of the world and the misery of human life." The stern monastic energy of language throughout this treatise displays in another form the strength of Innocent's character: had he remained in seclusion he might have founded an order more severe than that of Benedict, as active as those which he was destined to sanction, the Dominicans and Franciscans. But he was to show his contempt of the world not by renouncing but by ruling it.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cœlestine was of the house of Bobo, a branch of the Orsini.

<sup>2</sup> This work, written in not inelegant Latin, is monastic to its core. It asserts the Augustinian notion of the transmission of original sin with repulsive nakedness. Nothing can be baser or more miserable than human nature thus propagated. I cannot help quoting a strange passage: "*Omnes nascimur ejulantes ut nostram miseriam exprimamus. Masculus enim recenter natus dicit A, fœmina 'E, quotquot nascuntur ab Eva.' Quid est igitur Eva nisi heu ha! Utrumque dolentis est interjectio, doloris expri-*

Cœlestine on his death-bed had endeavored to nominate his successor : he had offered to resign the Papacy if the Cardinals would elect John of Colonna. But, even if consistent with right and with usage, the words of dying sovereigns rarely take effect. Of twenty-eight Cardinals,<sup>1</sup> five only were absent ; of the rest the unanimous vote fell on the youngest of their body, on the Cardinal Lothair. No irregularity impaired the authority of his election ; there was no murmur of opposition or schism : the general suffrage of the clergy and the people of Rome was confirmed by the unhesitating assent of Christendom. The death of the Emperor, the infancy of his son, the state of affairs in Germany, made all secure on the side of the Empire. Lothair was only thirty-seven years old, almost an unprecedented age for a Pope ;<sup>2</sup> even a mind like his might tremble at this sudden elevation. He was as yet but in deacon's orders ; he had to accumulate those of priest, bishop, and so become Pope. It may be difficult in some cases to dismiss all suspicion of hypocrisy, when men who have steadily held the Papacy

*mens magnitudinem.*" — i. 3. This puerility does not contrast more strongly with the practical wisdom of Innocent, than sentences like this with his haughtiness: "O superba præsumptio, et præsumptuosa superbia! quæ non tantum Angelos Deo voluisti adæquare, sed etiam homines præsumpsisti deificare." — ii. c. 92.

<sup>1</sup> The list in Ciacconius, vol. ii. p. 2. Hurter, *Leben Innocent III.*, i. 73, gives the names of the absentees.

<sup>2</sup> Walter der Vogelweide, who attributes all the misery of the civil war in Germany to Innocent, closes his poem with these words (modernized by K. Simrock): —

" Ich hörte fern in einer Klaus  
Ein jammern ohne Ende :  
Ein Klausner rang die Hände ;  
Er klagte Gott sein bittres Leid ;

*O weh, der Papst ist allzu jung, Herr Gott, hilf deiner Christenheit."*

Simrock, p. 175.



before them as the object of their ambition, have affected to decline the tiara, and played off a graceful and yielding resistance. But the strength, as well as the deep religious seriousness of Lothair's character, might make him naturally shrink from the assumption of such a dignity at an age almost without example; and in times if favorable to the aggrandizement of the Papacy, therefore of more awful responsibility. The Cardinals who proclaimed him saluted him by the name of Innocent, in testimony of his blameless life. In his inauguration sermon broke forth the character of the man; the unmeasured assertion of his dignity, protestations of humility which have a sound of pride. "Ye see what manner of servant that is 'whom the Lord hath set over his people; no other than the vicegerent of Christ; the successor of Peter. He stands in the midst between God and man; below God, above man; less than God, more than man. He judges all, is judged by none, for it is written—'I will judge.' But he whom the preëminence of dignity exalts, is lowered by his office of a servant, that so humility may be exalted, and pride abased; for God is against the high-minded, and to the lowly he shows mercy; and he who exalteth himself shall be abased. Every valley shall be lifted up, every hill and mountain laid low!" The letters in which he announced his election to the king of France, and to the other realms of Christendom, blend a decent but exaggerated humility with the consciousness of power: Innocent's confidence in himself transpires through his confidence in the divine protection.<sup>1</sup>

The state of Christendom might have tempted a less

<sup>1</sup> Epist. i. *et seq.*

ambitious prelate to extend and consolidate his supremacy. At no period in the history of the State of Christendom. pacy could the boldest assertion of the spiritual power, or even the most daring usurpation, so easily have disguised itself to the loftiest mind under the sense of duty to God and to mankind ; never was season so favorable for the aggrandizement of the Pope, never could his aggrandizement appear a greater blessing to the world. Wherever Innocent cast his eyes over Christendom and beyond the limits of Christendom, appeared disorder, contested thrones, sovereigns oppressing their subjects, subjects in arms against their sovereigns, the ruin of the Christian cause. In Italy the crown of Naples on the brows of an infant ; the fairest provinces under the galling yoke of fierce German adventurers ; the Lombard republics, Guelf or Ghibelline, at war within their walls, at war or in implacable animosity against each other ; the Empire distracted by rival claimants for the throne, one vast scene of battle, intrigue, almost of anarchy ; the tyrannical and dissolute Philip Augustus King of France, before long the tyrannical and feeble John of England. The Byzantine empire is tottering to its fall ; the kingdom of Jerusalem confined almost to the city of Acre. Every realm seemed to demand, or at least to invite, the interposition, the mediation, of the head of Christendom ; in every land one party at least, or one portion of society, would welcome his interference in the last resort for refuge or for protection. Nor did Innocent shrink from that which might have crushed a less energetic spirit to despair ; from the Jordan to the Atlantic, from the Mediterranean to beyond the Baltic his influence is felt and confessed ; his vast correspondence

shows at once the inexhaustible activity of his mind ; he is involved simultaneously or successively in the vital interests of every kingdom in the western world. The history of Innocent's Papacy will be more full and intelligible by tracing his acts in succession rather than in strict chronological order, in every part of Christendom. I. In Rome, and II. In Italy. III. In the Empire. IV. In France. V. In England. VI. In Spain. VII. In the Northern kingdoms. VIII. In Bulgaria and Hungary. IX. In the Byzantine Empire and the East, in Constantinople, Armenia, and the Holy Land. Finally, X. In the wars of Languedoc with the Albigensian and other schismatics ; and XI. XII. In the establishment of the two new monastic orders, that of St. Dominic and that of St. Francis.

The affairs of Rome and of Italy are so intimately blended that it may not be convenient to keep them entirely disconnected.

I. The city of Rome was the first to acknowledge the ascendancy of the new Pontiff. Since Rome. the treaty with Clement III. the turbulence of the Roman people seemed sunk to rest. As well the stirring reminiscences of their ancient grandeur as the democratic Christianity of Arnold of Brescia were forgotten. The mutinous spirit which had twice risen in insurrection against Lucius III., and had driven that Pontiff into the north of Italy, had been allayed.<sup>1</sup> Clement had appeased them for a time by the promise of sacrificing Tusculum to their implacable hostility ; his successor Cœlestine III. had consummated or extorted from the Emperor that sacrifice.<sup>2</sup> A judicious

<sup>1</sup> See vol. iv. p. 439.

<sup>2</sup> See vol. iv. p. 449.

payment distributed by Clement among the senators had reconciled them to the papal supremacy. The great Roman families, though their private feuds were not even suspended, were allied to the church by the promotion of their ecclesiastical members to the Cardinalate.<sup>1</sup> The Roman aristocracy had furnished many names among the twenty-seven who concurred in the elevation of the Roman Lothair. Innocent pursued the policy of Clement III. The usual largess on the accession of the new Pope was silently and skilfully distributed through the thirteen quarters of the city. The prefect of the city, now the representative of the imperial authority (the empire was in abeyance), was either overawed or won to take a strong oath of allegiance to the Pope,<sup>2</sup> by which the sovereignty of the Emperor was silently abrogated. Innocent substituted his own Justiciaries for those appointed by the senate: the whole authority emanated from the Pope, and was held during his pleasure; to the Pope alone the judges were responsible; they were bound to resign when called upon by him. In his own spiritual courts Innocent endeavored to set the example of strict and unbought justice; to remove the inveterate reproach of venality, which withheld the concourse of appellants to Rome, and was so far injurious to the people. He severely limited the fees and emoluments of his officers; three times a week he held a public consistory for smaller causes; the gravest he meditated in private, and the most accomplished canon lawyer might acquire

<sup>1</sup> In Innocent's earlier promotions I observe a Brancalone, a Pierleoni (qu. Peter Leonis), a Bisontio from Orvieto, a Crescentius, besides several connected with the Conti. — Additions to Ciacconius.

<sup>2</sup> Gesta, viii. Epist. 1, 23, 577, 578. The oath of Peter the Prefect, i. 577.

knowledge from the decrees drawn up by Innocent himself. Even the commencement of Innocent's reign shows how the whole Christian world paid its tribute of appeal to Rome.<sup>1</sup> There was one cause concerning the jurisdiction of the sees of Braga and Compostella over great part of Spain and Portugal ; a cause for the metropolitanate of Brittany between the Bishops of Tours and Dôle ; a cause of the Archbishop of Canterbury concerning the parish of Lambeth.

Yet neither could the awe, nor the dexterous management of Innocent, nor the wealth of the tributary world, subdue or bribe refractory Rome to peace. There were still factious nobles, John Rainer, one of the Peter Leonis, and John Capocio, a man of stirring popular eloquence, who endeavored to excite the people to reclaim their rights. Still the versatile people listened with greedy ears to these republican tenets. Still the Orsini were in deadly feud with the Scotti, the maternal house of the Pope. Still were there outbursts of insurrection in the turbulent city ; still outbursts of war in the no less turbulent territory ; Rome was at war with her neighbors, her neighbors with each other. Ere three years of Innocent's reign had passed, Rome, in defence of Viterclano, besieged by the Viterbans, takes up arms against Viterbo.

The Romans cared not for the liberty of Viterclano, but they had old arrears of hatred against Viterbo ; and once the waters troubled, their gain was sure.<sup>2</sup> If

<sup>1</sup> Under the Lateran palace, near the kitchen, was a change of money, in which the coin of various countries, vessels of gold and silver were heaped up, exchanged, or sold, by the prætors, for the expenses of the Curia. These " tables of the money-changers " Innocent abolished at once. — Gesta, xli.

<sup>2</sup> " Quod non poterant in aqua clara piscari, cœperunt aquam turbare." — Gesta, c. 133. October, 1200.



the Pope was against them, Rome was against the Pope; if the Pope was on their side, Viterbo revolted from the Pope. The Tuscans moved to the aid of Viterbo; but the shrewd Pope, unexpectedly, on the pretext that the Viterbans had despised his commination, and even his excommunication, took the part of the Romans; a victory which they obtained over superior forces under the walls of Viterbo was attributed to his intercession; many of them renounced their hostility to the Pope.<sup>1</sup> A second time they marched out; they were supplied with money by the Pope's brother, Richard Count of Sora. While the Pope was celebrating mass on the holy Epiphany, they won a great victory,<sup>2</sup> doubtless through the irresistible prayers of the Pope; it was reported that they brought home as trophies the great bell and the chains of one of the gates of Viterbo, which were long shown in Rome. The captive Viterbans, men of rank, were sent to Canaparia, where some of them died in misery. The most distinguished, Napoleon, Count of Campilia, and Burgudio, prothonotary of Viterbo, the Pope afterwards, in compassion, kept in honorable custody in his own palace. Napoleon, to the indignation of the Romans, made his escape. The Pope even mediated a peace between Rome and Viterbo. Viterbo was humbled to the restoration of the brazen gates of the church of St. Peter, and set up again some brazen vessels in the porch, which she had borne away or broken in the days of Frederick Barbarossa.

<sup>1</sup> "Quidam qui consueverant in contradictionem Domini Papæ ora laxare, publice dicerent, quod ita jam erant ipsorum linguæ, quod nunquam de cetero contra summum pontificem loquerentur." — *Gesta*, 133.

<sup>2</sup> This latter point rests on the authority of Ciacconius, who does not give his authority. — *Vit. Innocent. III.* p. 8. The *Gesta* makes out clearly two battles.

The Pope had the strength to decide another quarrel by sterner measures. Two brothers, lords of Narni and Gabriano, were arraigned by Lando lord of Colmezzo and his brothers, for seizing some of their lands. The Pope commanded restitution. The lords of Narni and Gabriano pledged the lands to the Pope's turbulent adversaries in Rome, John Rainer, Peter Leone, and John Capocio. The Pope instantly ordered the territories of Narni and Gabriano to be laid waste with fire and sword, suspended the common laws of war, sanctioned the ravaging their harvests, felling their fruit-trees, destroying mills, driving away cattle. Innocent condescended or ventured to confront the popular leaders in the face of the people. He summoned a great congregation of the Romans, spoke with such commanding eloquence, that the menacing but abashed nobles were obliged to renounce the land which they had received in dawn, and to swear full obedience.<sup>1</sup>

Another year, and now the Orsini, the kindred of the late Pope Cœlestine, and the Scotti, the A.D. 1202. kindred of Pope Innocent, are in fierce strife. The Pope had retired for the summer to Velletri. He summoned both parties, and extorted an oath to keep the peace. The senator Pandulph de Suburra seized and destroyed a stronghold of the Orsini. Not many months elapsed, a murder was committed on the person of Tebaldo, a man connected with both families, by the sons of John Oddo, the Pope's cousin. The Orsini rose; they destroyed two towers belonging to the senator of Rome. They were hardly prevented from

<sup>1</sup> Gesta, c. 134. "Adhuc eis minantibus et resistantibus coegit nobiles antedictos, ut pignoris contractu rescisso, mandatis ipsius se per omnia parituros juramentis et fide jussionibus promiserunt."

exposing the body under the windows of the palace of the Pope's brother, under those of the Pope himself. A.D. 1203. In the next year arises new strife on an affair of disputed property. The Pope is insulted during a solemn ceremonial. The Pope's adversaries make over the contested land to the senate and the people of Rome. The Pope protests, threatens in vain; the senator is besieged in the Capitol. The Pope finds it expedient to leave the rebellious city, he flies to Palestrina, to Ferentino, and passes the whole winter at Anagni. There he fell dangerously ill.

Rome, impatient of his presence, grew weary of his absence. In the interval had broken out a new, a fiercer strife for a change in the constitution. It was proposed to abrogate the office of a single senator, and to elect by means of twelve middle men, a senate of fifty-six. The Pontiff returned amid universal acclamations. Yet Innocent so far yielded as to permit one of the Peter Leoni house to name the senator. He named Gregory, one of his kindred, a man well disposed to the Pope, but wanting in energy. Still the contest continued to rage, the eloquent Capocio to harangue the multitude. Above this anarchy is seen the calm and majestic Pope, who, as though weary of such petty tumults, and intent on the greater affairs of the Pontificate, the humiliation of sovereigns, the reducing kingdoms to fiefs of the holy see, might seem, having quietly acquiesced in the senate of fifty-six, deliberately to have left the turbulent nobles, on one side the Orsinis, the Peter Leonis, the Capocios, the Baroncellis; on the other, the former senator Pandulph de Suburra, his own brother Count Richard, his kindred the Scotti, to vie with each other in building and strengthening their

fortress palaces, and demolishing, whenever they were strong enough, those of their adversaries. To grant the wishes of the people of Rome was the certain way to disappoint them. Erelong they began to execrate the feeble rule of the fifty-six, and implored a single senator.<sup>1</sup> But throughout at least all the earlier years of his Pontificate, Innocent was content with less real power in Rome than in any other region of Christendom.

II. But on the accession of Innocent, beyond the city walls and the immediate territory, all which belonged to or was claimed by the Roman see was in the hands of ferocious German adventurers, at the head each of his predatory foreign troops. Markwald of Anweiler, a knight of Alsace, the Seneschal of the Emperor Henry, called himself Duke of Ravenna, and was invested with the March of Ancona and all its cities. Diephold, Count of Acerra, had large territories in Apulia. Conrad of Lutzenberg,<sup>2</sup> a Swabian knight, as Duke of Spoleto, possessed that city, its domain, and Assisi. The estates of the Countess Matilda were held by Germans in the name of Philip, the brother of the Emperor Henry, who had hastened to Germany to push his claims on the Empire. Some few cities had asserted their independence; the sea-coast and Salerno were occupied by Benedetto Carisomi. Of these Markwald was the most formidable; his congenial valor and cruelty had recommended him

<sup>1</sup> "Unde populus adeo cœpit execrari, ut oportuerit Dominum Papam ad communem populi petitionem unum eis senatorem concedere." The last chapters of the *Gesta* are full of this wild and confused anarchy.

<sup>2</sup> Conrad was called by the strange name Mück-in-hirn, "fly in his brain," (like our "bee in his bonnet"): he was the wildest of these wild soldiers.

to the especial favor of Henry. He had been named by the Emperor on his death-bed Regent of Sicily.

Italy only awaited a deliverer from the German yoke. The annals of tyranny contain nothing more revolting than the cruelties of the Emperor Henry to his Italian subjects. While there was the profoundest sorrow in Germany at the loss of a monarch, if of severe justice, yet who, from his wisdom and valor, was compared with Solomon and David,<sup>1</sup> at his death the cry of rejoicing broke forth from Calabria to Lombardy. In asserting the Papal claims to the dominion of Romagna, and all to which the See of Rome advanced its pretensions, Innocent fell in with all the more generous aspirations of Italy, with the common sympathies of mankind. The cause of the Guelfs (these names are now growing into common use) was more than that of the Church, it was the cause of freedom and humanity. The adherents of the Ghibellines, at least the open adherents (for in most cities there was a secret if small Ghibelline faction), were only the lords of the German fortresses, the cities they occupied, and a few of the republics which dreaded the hostility of their neighbors more than a foreign yoke, Pisa, Cremona, Pavia, Markwald. Genoa. The hour of deliverance, if not of revenge, was come. Innocent summoned Markwald to

<sup>1</sup> "Omnia cum Papâ gaudent de morte tyranni . . .  
Mors necat et cuncti gaudent de morte sepulti,  
Apulus et Calaber, Siculus, Tuscusque, Ligurque."

*J. de Ceceano, Chronic. Foss. Nov. Muratori, viii.*

"Cujus mors Teutonicorum omnium omnibusque Germaniæ populis lamentabilis est in æternum, quod aliorum divitiis eos claros reddidit, terroremque eorum omnibus in circuitu nationibus per virtutem bellicam incussit, eosque præstantiores aliis gentibus nimium ostendit futuros, ni morte præventus foret. Per sapientiam Solomonis et per fortitudinem David regis scivit parcere subjectis et debellare superbos." — Theodoric von Esternach. Martene, Coll. Amp. iv. 462.



surrender the territories of the Church. Markwald was conscious of his danger, and endeavored to lure the Pontiff into an alliance. He offered to make him greater than Pope had ever been since the days of Constantine.<sup>1</sup> But Innocent knew his strength in the universal, irresistible, indelible hatred of the foreign, the German, the barbarian yoke: he rejected the treacherous overtures.<sup>2</sup> City after city, Ancona, Fermo, Osimo, Faño, Sinigaglia, Pesaro, Iesi, dashed down the German banner; Camerina and Ascoli alone remained faithful to Markwald. Markwald revenged himself by sallying from the gates of Ravenna, ravaging the whole region, burning, plundering, destroying homesteads and harvests, castles and churches. Innocent opened the Papal treasures, borrowed large sums of money, raised an army; hurled an excommunication against the rebellious vassal of the Church, in which he absolved all who had sworn allegiance to Markwald from their oaths. Markwald withdrew into the south of Italy.

Conrad of Lutzenberg,<sup>3</sup> Duke of Spoleto, beheld the fall of Markwald with consternation; he made the humblest offers of subjection, the <sup>Conrad of</sup> <sup>Lutzenberg.</sup> most liberal offers of tribute. But Innocent knew that any compromise with the Germans would be odious to his Italian subjects: he demanded instant, uncondi-

<sup>1</sup> "Se ecclesiam magis quam ulli imperatores auxissent, amplificaturum." — Otto de S. Blaise, c. 45; Rainald, sub ann. 1298.

<sup>2</sup> Epist. i. 38. "Licet autem dominus Papa conditionem istam utilem reputaret, qui tamen multi scandalisabantur ex eâ tanquam vellet Teutonicos in Italia confovere, qui crudeli tyrannide redegerant eos in gravissimam servitutem, in favorem libertatis declinans, non accepit oblata." — Gesta, Innocent, c. 9. Boehmer (Regesta, p. vii.) quotes this, among other passages, to show the barbarity of the Germans, the hatred of the Italians.

<sup>3</sup> According to M. Abel (Philip der Hohenstauffer), properly Conrad of Urslingen.

tional submission. Conrad surrendered all the patrimonial domains of the Pope in his possession without reserve; the other cities resumed their freedom. On these terms Innocent permitted the Cardinal Legate to receive at Narni Conrad's oath of unqualified fidelity on the Gospels, on the Cross, and on the Holy Relics. He appointed the Cardinal San Gregorio the Governor of the Dukedom of Spoleto, and of the County of Assisi and its domains. Conrad retired to Germany. In person Innocent visited Reate, Spoleto, Perugia, Todi; everywhere he was received as the Sovereign, as the deliverer. The Archbishop of Ravenna alone resisted the encroachments of Innocent, displayed the Imperial investiture, and preserved the territories of his church.<sup>1</sup> Throughout Italy, the precarious state of the Imperial power, the sudden rise of a vigorous Pontifical administration, gave new life to the popular and Italian cause. The Tuscan League, the Lombard League, renewed their approaches to more intimate relations with the Pope; but to the Tuscans the language of Innocent was that of a master. Their demands to choose their own rectors with a sovereign Prior to preside over their League, he answered by a summons to unqualified submission to him, as heir to the Countess Matilda, and sovereign of the whole Duchy of Tuscany. "I have seen," he said, "with my own eyes, that the Duchy of Tuscany belongs of right to the Pope." Without the Papal protection the League could not subsist: he warned the cities lest, rejecting it, they should fall by the sword of the stranger.<sup>2</sup> But the most remarkable document is an address to all the

<sup>1</sup> Murator. sub ann. 1198.

<sup>2</sup> Epist. i. 15, 35.

cities, in which the similitude, now growing into favor, of the spiritual and temporal power to the sun and moon, the temporal only deriving a reflected light from the spiritual, is wrought out with careful study.<sup>1</sup> But as regarded Italy, both powers met in the supreme Pontiff. The Ghibelline city of Pisa was placed under an interdict for presuming to assert its daring independence of the League: a temporary suspension of the interdict was haughtily and ungraciously granted.

The German dominion was driven into the South: there it was still strong from the occupation of the chief fortresses.<sup>2</sup> Constantia, the widow of Henry, now Queen, or at least left natural guardian of the realm, deemed it prudent, or was actuated by her own inclinations, to separate herself from the German cause, and to throw herself and her son upon the native interest. She sent three Neapolitan nobles to demand her infant son Frederick from Iesi, where he <sup>Queen</sup> <sup>Constantia.</sup> had been brought up by the wife of Conrad of Lutzenberg; she caused him to be crowned in Palermo as joint sovereign of Sicily. She disclaimed Markwald the Duke of Ravenna, and declared him an enemy to the king and to the kingdom. She commanded the foreign troops to leave Sicily; they retired, reluctant and brooding over revenge, to the castles on the mainland. She submitted to request the investiture of the realm for her son as a fief from the Papal See. Innocent saw his own strength, and her weakness. He condescended to her petition on the condition of her paying due allegiance to him as her lord for the king-

<sup>1</sup> Epist. i. 401, and in the Gesta.

<sup>2</sup> Epist. i. 35. "Marcualdum imperii seneschalcum cum Teutonicis omnibus de regno exclusit." — Rich. San. Germ.

dom of Naples and Sicily, the patrimony of the Holy See.<sup>1</sup> He seized the opportunity of enforcing hard terms, the revocation of certain privileges which had been granted by his predecessors to the faithful Norman princes as the price of their fidelity. Constantia silently yielded; she received a bull, which in the strongest terms proclaimed the absolute feudal superiority of the Pope over the whole kingdom of Naples and Sicily: that extraordinary pretension, grounded on no right but on the assertion of right, had now, by its repeated assertion on one part, its feeble denial or acceptance on the other, grown into an established usage. The bull pronounced that the kingdom of Sicily belonged to the jurisdiction and to the property of the Church of Rome. The Queen was to swear allegiance, her son to do so directly he came of age. A tribute was to be paid. The bishops, under all circumstances, had the right of appeal to Rome; all offences of the clergy, except high treason, were to be judged by the ecclesiastical courts. Sicily became a subject-kingdom, a province of the Papacy, under the constant superintendence of a Legate.

Before the bull had been prepared, Constantia fell ill. Either in an access of devotion, or of maternal solicitude for her infant son, for whom she would secure the most powerful protection, she bequeathed him to the guardianship of his liege lord the Pope.<sup>2</sup> Innocent accepted the charge; in his consolatory letter to the child, he assured Frederick, that though God had visited him by the death of his father and mother, he had provided him with a more worthy father —

<sup>1</sup> Epist. i. 410, 413.

<sup>2</sup> Innocent, Epist. i. 322.

his own vicar on earth; a better mother — the Church.<sup>1</sup>

Constantia died on the 27th of November.<sup>2</sup> Innocent was thus, if he could expel the Germans, A.D. 1198.  
virtually King of Sicily, master of his own Death of  
Constantia.  
large territories, and as the ally and protector of the great Republican Leagues the dominant power in Italy; and all this in less than one year after his accession to the Papal throne.<sup>3</sup>

But the elements of discord were not so easily awed into peace. The last will of Constantia, besides the guardianship of the Pope, had appointed a Council of Regency: the Chancellor, the subtle and ambitious Walter of Palear Bishop of Troja (whose brothers, and perhaps himself, were in dangerous correspondence with Markwald), the Archbishops of Palermo, Monreale, and Capua. She trusted not to the unrewarded piety or charity of the Pontiff: for the protection of her son Sicily was to pay yearly thirty thousand pieces of gold; <sup>4</sup> all his other expenses were to be charged on the revenue of the kingdom. But her death opened a new scene of intrigue and daring to Markwald. He resumed the title of Seneschal of the Empire, laid claim to the administration of Sicily and the guardianship of

<sup>1</sup> Epist. i. 565.

<sup>2</sup> Aged 45; a year and 19 days after her husband.

<sup>3</sup> He interfered soon after in the affairs of the Lombard League. Parma and Piacenza had quarrelled about the possession of Borgo San Domino. He commanded his legate to take counsel with the bishops to keep the peace; threatened excommunication, and ordered the castle to be placed in his own hands. — Epist. ii. 39.

<sup>4</sup> The tarini varied in value. The ounce of gold, about 21 grammes, 10 cent. (French weight), was divided into 24 tarini. Its value would be about 2 francs, 63 c., 75 m. The 30,000 would amount to about 79,125 francs. M. Cherrier estimates that it would represent five times the amount in present money. — *Lutte des Papes*, ii. 40, note.



the infant sovereign, alleging a testament of the Emperor, which invested him in that charge. The nobles of Sicily, however they might dread or detest the Germans, were not more disposed to be the mere ministers of the Pope. They received the Legate who came to administer the oath of allegiance with coldness; he returned to Rome. Markwald, in the mean time, had placed himself at the head of a powerful band of adventurers: he fell on the town of St. Germano, and had almost become master of the great monastery of Monte Casino, which was defended for eight days by a garrison of the Pope, and in which several cardinals had taken refuge. On the day of St. Maur, A.D. 1198. the beloved companion of St. Benedict, the serene sky was suddenly clouded; a terrific storm broke out, overthrew the tents of Markwald's army, and caused such a panic dread of the avenging saint, that they fled on all sides.<sup>1</sup> Innocent issued a proclamation summoning the whole realm of Naples and Sicily to arms. He reminded them of their sufferings under Markwald and Markwald's master; how their princes, and even the clergy, had been tortured, mutilated, blinded, roasted (as he says) before slow fires.<sup>2</sup> The Pope had not spared the Papal treasures: he had assembled troops for their aid from Lombardy, Tuscany, Romagna, Campania. In his warlike address to the clergy, they were commanded on every Sunday,

<sup>1</sup> "Capit more *Teutonico* in terram monasterii desævire." — Rich. San Germ. ad 1198. It is remarkable that Innocent says not a word in his letters of the miracle; he ascribes the discomfiture of Markwald to the valor of the barons and knights who had taken arms on his side.

<sup>2</sup> "Vix est aliquis in toto regno, qui in se vel suis, personâ vel rebus, consanguineis vel amicis, grave non incurrerit per Teutonicos detrimentum." — Reg. Innocent. No. ii.

and on every festival, to renew the solemn excommunication, with quenched candles and tolling bells, against Markwald and all his accomplices.<sup>1</sup> Markwald had again recourse to craft and dissimulation. Through the Archbishop of Mentz (who was in Rome on his return from the Holy Land) he made offers to the Pope which showed that he thought Innocent as unscrupulous as himself. He asserted the bastardy of Frederick; proposed that Innocent should invest him, Markwald, with the kingdom of Sicily. He would pay the Pope at once the enormous sum of 20,000 ounces of gold;<sup>2</sup> the like sum on being put in possession of Palermo. He would double the annual tribute, and rule the island under the absolute control of the Pope. These offers being rejected, he was seized with a sudden and passionate desire of spiritual reconciliation with the Church. It was a strange contest; Markwald endeavoring by humble civilities, by menaces, by lavish offers, to extort absolution on the easiest terms from the Cardinals. He declared himself ready to swear unreserved obedience in spiritual matters, in temporal more cautiously, to all just mandates of the Pope. Legates were sent to Veroli to receive his oath — Octavian the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, Guido Cardinal Presbyter of S. Maria in Transtevere, Ugolino Cardinal Deacon of S. Eustachio. He invited them to a banquet in a neighboring convent, and Markwald himself served them with the utmost humility; but audible murmurs were heard at the close that they were to be taken prisoners, and compelled to grant the unconditional absolution. Octavian and Guido were

<sup>1</sup> Epist. i. 557 to 566.

<sup>2</sup> Gesta, ch. xxii.

frightened; Ugolino took courage, and produced a bull of the Pope, with which the wary Innocent had provided them, prescribing the form of the oath, which implied the absolute abandonment of the bailiwick of Sicily, restoration of the patrimony of St. Peter, compensation for plunder, especially of the monastery of Monte Casino; and, above all, Markwald was to swear to respect the persons of all ecclesiastics, especially of the Cardinals of the Church. There was a wild and threatening tumult among the German soldiery and the populace against the Cardinals. But Markwald had not the courage to proceed to violence. The Legates were permitted to return to Veroli: Markwald took the prescribed oath, and received absolution.

But the absolution thus obtained at Veroli by a May, 1199. feigned submission was soon forfeited. Markwald would not renounce, he still affected the title of guardian of Sicily: he called himself Seneschal. In this name the jealous sagacity of Innocent detected latent pretensions to the protectorate. An excommunication more full, if possible, more express, more maledictory, was hurled against the recreant German. Every one who supplied provisions, clothing, ships, or troops to Markwald fell under the same anathema.<sup>1</sup> Any clerk who officiated in his presence incurred deprivation. Markwald retired to Salerno; a fleet from Ghibelline Pisa was ready to convey him to Sicily. He crossed the straits; received the submission of many cities, was welcomed by many noble families, by the whole Saracen population. Innocent pursued him with the strongest manifestoes. He addressed a letter to the counts, barons, citizens, and the whole people of

<sup>1</sup> Epist. ii. 179; and iii. 280.

Sicily. He reminded them of the atrocious cruelties perpetrated by the Emperor Henry and his German followers; announced the excommunication of Markwald, the absolution of all his adherents from their oaths of fidelity. "He is come to Sicily with the pirate William the Fat to usurp the throne; to say of the infant Frederick, 'This is the heir, let us slay him, and take possession of his inheritance.' He is leagued with the Saracens; he is prepared to glut their throats with Christian blood, to abandon Christian wives to their lusts." Towards the Saracens, nevertheless, Innocent expresses himself with mildness; "if they remain faithful to the King, he will not merely maintain, he will augment their privileges." The Pope went further: he addressed a solemn admonition to the Saracens. "They knew by experience the gentleness of the Apostolic See, the barbarity of Markwald. They had been eye-witnesses of his cruelties, the drowning in the sea, the roasting of priests over slow fires, the flagellation of multitudes. He who was so cruel to his fellow Christians would be even more ruthless to strangers, to those of other rites and other creeds. He who could ungratefully and rebelliously rise against the son of his liege lord would little respect the rights of foreigners; all oaths to them would be despised by one who had broken all his oaths to the Roman See."<sup>1</sup> With still more singular incongruity, he assures the Saracens that he has sent as their protectors the Cardinal of St. Laurence in Lucina, the Archbishops of Naples and Tarentum, as well as his own relatives John the Marshal and Otho of Palumbria.<sup>2</sup> Markwald, notwithstanding these denuncia-

<sup>1</sup> Epist. ii. 226.<sup>2</sup> Epist. i. 489. Nov. 24, 1199.

tions and addresses, pursued his way and appeared before Palermo.

In Apulia, warlike cardinals, and even James the Marshal, the cousin of the Pope, though he showed considerable military skill as well as valor, were no antagonists against the disciplined and experienced Germans, Diephold, and Frederick Malati, who held Calabria. Innocent wanted a warrior of fame and generalship to lead his forces. France was the land to supply bold and chivalrous adventurers. Sybilla, the widow of Tancred of Sicily, dethroned by Henry, had made her escape from her prison in the Tyrol. She married her eldest daughter to Walter de Brienne, of a noble but impoverished house. Walter de Brienne came to Rome to demand the inheritance of his wife, the principality of Tarentum and the county of Lecce, which Henry had settled on the descendants of Tancred. Walter was the man whom Innocent needed. He was at once invested in the possession of Tarentum and Lecce; at the same time he was sworn to assert no claim to the kingdom, but to protect the rights of the infant Sovereign. Piety, justice and policy, equally demanded this security for the Pontiff, as guardian of Frederick; a security precarious enough from a powerful, probably an ambitious stranger. Walter returned to France to levy troops. Markwald, in the mean time, with his own forces and with the Saracens, besieged Palermo; the Papal troops, headed by the Archbishop of Naples, the Marshal and the Legate, came, the former directly by sea, to the aid of Walter the Chancellor, who had refused all the advances of Markwald. A battle took place, in which Markwald suffered a total defeat. Magded, the Emir of the Sar-



acens, was slain. In the baggage of Markwald was found, or said to be found, a will with a golden seal, purporting to be that of the Emperor Henry. It commanded his wife and son to recognize all the Papal rights over Sicily; it bequeathed Sicily, in case of the death of his son, in the fullest terms to the Pope. It commanded the immediate restitution of the estates of the Countess Matilda by the Empire to the Pope. If this will was made during the last illness of the Emperor (yet it contemplates the contingency of his wife dying before him), he might have been disposed either as leaving a helpless wife and an infant heir, to secure the protection of the Pope, and so the surrender of the Matildine territories may have been designed as a direct reward for the confirmation of his son in the Empire; or the whole may have been framed in a fit of death-bed penitence. The suspicious part was another clause, bequeathing the duchy of Ravenna, with Bertinoro, and the march of Ancona, to Markwald;<sup>1</sup> but even this, if the Duke died without heirs, was to revert to the Roman See.

The appearance of Walter de Brienne at the head of a small but chosen band of knights; his com- June, 1201.  
mission by the Pope as the leader of the faithful,<sup>2</sup> his rapid successes, his defeat of Diephold before Capua, the retreat of the Germans into their fortresses, his peaceful occupation of Tarentum, Lecce, and great part of Apulia, alarmed, or gave pretence for alarm, to the great nobles of Sicily. The ambitious church-

<sup>1</sup> The will is in the *Gesta*, xxvii. It is of very doubtful authenticity. Could it have been forged by Markwald, to be produced if occasion required? or was it from other hands?

<sup>2</sup> "Domino protegente fideles ab infidelibus." — *Gesta*, c. xxx.

man Walter of Troja, the Chancellor, aspired to the vacant archbishopric of Palermo. Innocent had been obliged to consent to his taking possession of the temporalities of the See, though he withheld the pallium.<sup>1</sup> The Chancellor had the strongest apprehensions of the progress of Walter de Brienne. A gradual approximation took place between the Chancellor Archbishop and Markwald. The Chancellor was to leave Markwald in undisputed possession of Apulia, Markwald the Chancellor in that of Sicily. The friendship was hollow and mistrustful. Each suspected and accused the other of designs on the Crown — Markwald for himself, Walter for his brother, Gentile Count of Manupelles. Both, however, were equally jealous of Walter de Brienne: Markwald as already more than his equal in the kingdom of Naples. The Chancellor assumed loyal apprehension for the endangered rights of the infant Frederick, whom the Pope, as he suspected, would betray. Innocent was compelled to justify himself in a long letter addressed to the young Frederick, whom he warned to mistrust all around him, and to place his sole reliance on the parental guardianship of the Pope. The Chancellor Walter of Troja was now in the kingdom of Naples, levying money for the service of the realm, which he is accused of having done in the most rapacious manner, not sparing the treasures, nor even the holy vessel of the churches. He might plead, perhaps, the tribute paid by the realm to the Pope. To the Papal legate, the Bishop of Porto, he professed unbounded submission, took the oath of allegiance, and received absolution. When, however, he was commanded not to oppose Walter de Brienne, against

<sup>1</sup> May 3, 1203.

whom he was in almost armed confederacy with the Germans, he broke fiercely out, as if in indignant patriotism: "If St. Peter himself uttered such command, he would not obey; the fear of hell should not tempt him to be guilty of such treason;" and he is said to have blasphemed (such is the term) against the Pope himself.<sup>1</sup> From the presence of the Legate he set out openly to join Diephold. A battle took place near Bari. Walter de Brienne, though embarrassed by the presence and the fears of the Legate, gained a complete victory: many important prisoners, among them a brother of Diephold, were taken.

But in Sicily as well as Naples the partisans of Walter of Troja, comprehending the greater part of the Norman and native nobles, were now in alliance with the Germans. Markwald entered Palermo, and became master of the person of the King. Sept. 1202.  
Death of  
Markwald. He died shortly after of an unsuccessful or unskilful operation for the stone. The palace and the person of the King were seized by a powerful Norman noble, William of Capperone. From him Walter the Chancellor, who still claimed to be Bishop of Troja, and, despite of the Pope, Archbishop of Palermo, endeavored by a long course of intrigue to wrest away the precious charge. In the kingdom of Naples, the death of Walter de Brienne, who was surprised, taken, and who died of his wounds<sup>2</sup> as a prisoner of Diephold, gave back the ascendancy to the German party. The Pope was constrained to accept their precarious and doubtful submission; to admit them to reconciliation with the Church. Diephold became the most power-

<sup>1</sup> Gesta, xxxiv.

<sup>2</sup> The battle, the 11th of June, 1205.

ful subject, and more than a subject in the kingdom of Naples.

Thus grew up the young Frederick, the ward of the Pope, without that pious, or at least careful education<sup>1</sup> which might have taught him respect and gratitude to the Holy See; among Churchmen who conspired against or openly defied the head of the Church; taught from his earliest years by every party to mistrust the other; taught by the Sicilians to hate the Germans, by the Germans to despise the Sicilians; taught that in the Pope himself, his guardian, there was no faith or loyalty; that his guardian would have sacrificed him, had it been his interest, to the house of Tancred. All around him was intrigue, violence, conflict. Government was almost suspended throughout Sicily. The Saracens hardly acknowledging any allegiance to the throne, warred with impartiality against the Christians of both parties; yet neither had any repugnance to an alliance with the gallant Infidels against the opposing party. Such was the training of him who was in a short time to wear the Imperial crown, to wage the last strife of the house of Hohenstaufen with his mother, rather perhaps his step-mother, the Church.

<sup>1</sup> The Cardinal Cencio Savelli, afterwards the mild Honorius III., had at first the nominal charge of his education.

## CHAPTER II.

## INNOCENT AND THE EMPIRE.

THE Empire, now vacant, might seem to invite the commanding interposition of Innocent. It <sup>Vacancy of the Empire.</sup> opened almost a wider field for the ambition of the Pope, and for those exorbitant pretensions to power which disguised themselves as tending to promote peace and order by expanding the authority of the Church, than Italy itself. But it was not so easy to reconcile these vast demands for what was called spiritual freedom, but which was in fact spiritual dominion, with the real interests of Germany. The prosperity, the peace of the Empire depended on the strength, the influence, the unity of the temporal power; the security, the advancement of the Papacy on its weakness and its anarchy. A vigorous and uncontested Sovereignty could alone restrain the conflicting states, and wisely and temperately administered, might advance the social condition of Germany. At all events, such sovereignty was necessary to spare the realm from years of civil war, during which armed adventurers grew up, from their impregnable castles warring against each other, defying all government, wasting the land with fire and sword, preventing culture, inhibiting commerce, retarding civilization. But a powerful Emperor had always been found formidable to the Church, at least to the temporal rule of the



Papacy ; his claims to Italian dominion were only suspended by his inability to enforce them ; and the greater his strength, the less the independence of the German prelacy. The Emperor either domineered over them, or filled the important sees with his own favorites. The Pope could not but remember the long strife of his predecessors with the house of Hohenstaufen ; in them was centred all the hostility, all the danger of Ghibellinism ; they seemed born to be implacable foes of the Papacy : he might naturally shrink in execration at the recent cruelties of Henry, though he could hardly augur in the infant King of Sicily so obstinate an antagonist to his successors as Frederick II.

The perpetuation of the Empire in this haughty house was in itself a cause of serious apprehension ; it added immeasurably to the Imperial power, and every subordinate consideration must be sacrificed to the limitation of that power.

Immediately after the death of Henry, his brother Philip,<sup>1</sup> abandoning his first intention of descending to the south, and of taking with him the young Frederick, hastened to the Alps, which he reached not without difficulty, pursued, even menaced, by the murmurs and imprecations of the Italians. Already had Henry in his lifetime obtained the oath of many of the German princes to his infant son, as King of the Romans and heir of the Empire. Philip at first asserted, and seemed honestly disposed to assert

Philip retires  
to Germany.

<sup>1</sup> Philip had been intended for holy orders, was provost of Aix-la-Chapelle, had been chosen Bishop of Wurtzburg in 1191. In 1194 he accompanied the Emperor to Apulia; was named Duke of Tuscany, 1195; married to the Princess Irene; Duke of Swabia, 1196.

the claims of his nephew ; but an infant Emperor was too contrary to German usage, manifestly so unsuited to the difficult times, that Philip consented to be chosen King by a large body of princes and <sup>March 6.</sup> of prelates assembled at Mulhausen.<sup>1</sup> But the adverse party had not been inactive. The soul of this party was Adolph of Altena, the powerful, opulent, and crafty Archbishop of Cologne. The great prelates of the Rhine and the neighboring princes seemed to claim a kind of initiative. The Archbishop of Mentz, Conrad of Wittlesbach, was absent in the Holy Land ;<sup>2</sup> the Archbishop of Treves appeared at first on the side of the Archbishop of Cologne. They met at Andernach, and professed surprise that the rest of the princes were so slow in joining the legitimate Diet. They determined, of themselves, to raise up an antagonist to the house of Hohenstaufen. Three princes for different reasons refused to embark in the perilous contest. Richard of Cornwall was at length conscious of his folly in aspiring, as he had too often done, to the Empire. Berthold of Zahringen, who had once yielded, withdrew from prudence, or rather avarice.<sup>3</sup> Bernard of Saxony, as feeling himself unequal to the burden of Empire, and already pledged to the cause of Philip. The prelates turned their thoughts at length to the house of Henry the Lion, the irreconcilable adversary of the house of Swabia. Henry, the eldest Otho. son, was engaged in the Crusades ; the second, Otho,

<sup>1</sup> At Arnstadt, in Thuringia, according to Boehmer, Pref. p. ix. Compare the passage as to the spontaneous offer of the princes.

<sup>2</sup> Conrad of Radensburg, Bishop of Hildesheim, later of Wurtzburg, once a fellow-student of Thomas à Becket, was also in the Holy Land ; as also the eldest son of Henry the Lion.

<sup>3</sup> Annal. Argentin.

since the house had fallen under the ban of the Empire, had resided at the court of England, under the protection of Richard of Cornwall. By his valor he had attracted the notice of his uncle, King Richard Cœur de Lion: he had been created first Count of York, afterwards Count of Poitou. Otho could not have lived under a better training for the fostering his hereditary hatred and thirst of revenge against the house of Hohenstaufen, or for the love of chivalrous adventure. He had nothing to lose, an imperial crown to win. His uncle, Richard of England, could never  
A.D. 1198. forget his imprisonment in Germany, and the part taken by the Emperor in that galling and disgraceful transaction. The perfidy and avarice of Henry were to be visited in due retribution on his race.<sup>1</sup> Otho set forth on his expedition, to gain the Imperial crown, well furnished with English gold,<sup>2</sup> with some followers, and with provisions of war. In May he was proclaimed Emperor at Cologne; he was declared the champion of the Church: he owed his election to a few Churchmen. The Archbishop of Cologne either represented, or pretended to represent, besides his own vote, the Archbishop of Mentz. English gold bought the avaricious Archbishop of Treves. The Flemish nobles, allied with England, were almost unanimous in favor of Otho; many other princes, who

<sup>1</sup> By the English account King Richard by his money initiated the proceedings of Archbishop Adolph; he bought the crown for Otho: "*Rex Richardus divitiis et consiliis pollens, tantum egit muneribus et xeniis suis erga Archiepiscopum Coloniae et erga proceres imperii, quod omnibus aliis omissis, Othonem nepotem suum, mirae strenuitatis et elegantis corporis adolescentem elegerint.*" — Radulph. Coggeshal, ap. Martene, v. 851. Philip asserts this in his letter to the Pope. — Apud Innocent, Epist. i. 747.

<sup>2</sup> According to Arnold of Lubeck, 50,000 marks. "*Quæ in summariis ferebant quinquaginta dextrarii.*" — c. vii. 17.

had returned from the Crusades on the news of the Emperor's death, joined either from love of war, respect for the Church, or hatred of the Hohenstaufen, the growing party.

Nothing can be more sublime than the notion of a great supreme religious power, the representative of God's eternal and immutable justice upon earth, absolutely above all passion or interest, interposing with the commanding voice of authority in the quarrels of kings and nations, persuading peace by the unimpeachable impartiality of its judgments, and even invested in power to enforce its unerring decrees. But the sublimity of the notion depends on the arbiter's absolute exemption from the unextinguishable weaknesses of human nature. If the tribunal commands not unquestioning respect; if there be the slightest just suspicion of partiality; if it goes beyond its lawful province; if it has no power of compelling obedience; it adds but another element to the general confusion; it is a partisan enlisted on one side or the other, not a mediator conciliating conflicting interests, or overawing the collision of factions. Yet such was the Papal power in these times: often, no doubt, on the side of justice and humanity, too often on the other; looking to the interests of the Church alone, assumed, but assumed without ground to be the same as those of Christendom and mankind; the representative of fallible man rather than of the infallible God. Ten years of strife and civil war in Germany are to be traced, if not to the direct instigation, to the inflexible obstinacy of Pope Innocent III.

It was too much the interest of both parties to obtain the influence of the Pope in their favor, not to incline

them outwardly at least to submit their claims to his investigation. But it was almost as certain that one party at least would not abide by his unfavorable decree : and however awful the power of excommunication with which there could be no doubt that the Pope would endeavor to compel obedience, in no instance had the spiritual power, at least in later days, obtained eventual success.

Innocent assumed a lofty equity ; but the house of  
 Conduct of Henry the Lion had ever been devoted to the  
 Innocent. Pope ; the house of Swabia ungovernable, if  
 not inimical. His first measure against Philip was one  
 of cautious hostility. Philip was already under the ban  
 of the Church — I. As implicated with his brother in  
 the cruelties exercised against the family of the unfor-  
 tunate Tancred, the rival favored by the Pope for the  
 throne of Sicily. II. As having held by Imperial grant  
 the domains of the Countess Matilda, to which the  
 Feb. 1198. Popes maintained their right by anathema  
 against all who should withhold them from the See.  
 The Bishop of Sutri was sent as Legate to demand of  
 Philip the immediate release of Sybilla, the widow of  
 Tancred, and of her daughters, who were imprisoned  
 in Germany, as well as of the Archbishop of Salerno  
 their partisan. The German prelates of the Rhine  
 were commanded to support this demand, to sequester  
 the goods of all who had presumed to assist in the in-  
 carceration of an Archbishop, in itself an act of sacri-  
 lege.<sup>1</sup> The Chapter of Mentz, in the absence of the  
 Primate, was to pronounce an interdict not only on  
 those concerned in the imprisonment, and the whole  
 city in which it had taken place ; but also to bring

<sup>1</sup> Epist. i. 24, 25.



under the ban of the Church all German princes who did not heartily strive for their release : if satisfaction was not instantly made, the ban spread over the whole of Germany.<sup>1</sup> Philip himself was to be reminded of his state of excommunication, as usurper of the territories of the Church. Only on his giving full satisfaction on both points, the instantaneous release of the prisoners, especially the Archbishop of Salerno, and his surrender of all the lands of the Roman See, was the Bishop of Sutri empowered to grant absolution ; otherwise Philip could only receive it as a suppliant from the Pope himself. Thus the first act of the aspirant to the Empire was to be an acknowledgment of almost the highest pretensions of the Papal supremacy, a condemnation of his brother's policy, the cession of the lands of the Countess Matilda. Innocent had chosen a German by birth, perhaps from his knowledge of the language, for this important Legation, in full confidence, no doubt, that the interests of the Church would quench all feelings of nationality. But either from this nationality, from weakness, or love of peace, the Bishop of Sutri allowed himself to be persuaded by Philip to stretch to the utmost, if not to go beyond, his instructions. Philip consented in vague words to the amplest satisfaction ; and on this general promise, obtained a secret absolution from the Legate. Innocent disclaimed his weak envoy ; afterwards degraded him from his See, and banished him to a remote monastery, where he died in shame and grief.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It is remarkable that Innocent dwells on the sins of the luxurious and effeminate Sicilians, who had been visited on that account by the cruelties of the Germans, rather than on the tyranny and inhumanity of the Germans. — Epist. 26.

<sup>2</sup> Ughelli, *Italia Sacra*, i. 1275. Worms, June 29, 1198.

Yet Philip stood absolved by one representing the Papal authority. This objection to the validity of his election was removed; and in most other respects his superiority was manifest. The largest and most powerful part of the Empire acknowledged him; his army was the strongest; the treasures which his brother had brought from Sicily were lavished with successful prodigality; his garrison as yet occupied Aix-la-Chapelle, the city in which the Emperors were crowned; all the sacred regalia were in his hands. The Rhenish prelates and the nobles of Flanders stood almost alone on the side of Otho; but Richard of England had supplied him with large sums of money; and with the aid of the Flemish princes he made himself master of Aix-la-Chapelle, and was crowned in that city by the Archbishop of Cologne. Philip celebrated his coronation at Mentz, but the highest Prelate who would perform this rite was a foreigner, at least not a German, Aimo, Archbishop of the Tarentaise.

If Richard of England was on one side in this contest, Philip Augustus of France was sure to be on the other; and besides his rivalry with England, the King of France had personal and hereditary cause for hostility to Otho; and with the house of Hohenstaufen he had ever maintained friendly alliance.<sup>1</sup>

Innocent seemed to await the submission of the cause

<sup>1</sup> Godef. Mon. Arnold Lubeck. See Von Raumer, iii. p. 107. Gerv. Tilb. The King of France, writing to the Pope: "Ad hæc cum rex Angliæ per fas et nefas pecuniâ suâ mediante nepotem suum ad imperialem apicem conatur intrudere, vos nullatenus intrusionem illam, si placet, debetis admittere, quoniam in opprobrium coronæ nostræ cognoscitur redundare." — Innocent, Epist. i. 690.

to his arbitration; as yet, indeed, he was fully occupied with the affairs of Rome and Italy. The friends of Otho, who could well anticipate his <sup>Pope</sup> <sup>Innocent.</sup> favorable judgment, were the first to make their appeal. Addresses were sent to Rome in the name of Richard King of England, Count Baldwin of Flanders, the city of Milan, the Archbishop of Cologne, his suffragans the Bishops of Munster, Minden, Paderborn, Cambray and Utrecht, the Bishop of Strasburg, the Abbots of Verden and Corvey, Duke Henry of Brabant, with many Abbots and Counts. Most of these documents promised the most profound submission on the part of Otho to the Church; specifically abandoned the detestable practice<sup>1</sup> of seizing the goods of bishops and abbots on their decease, and pledged all the undersigned to the same loyal protection of the Church and all her rights. The answer of Innocent was courteous, but abstained from recognizing the title of Otho.

The civil war began its desolations. Philip at first gained great advantages; he advanced almost A.D. 1198. to the gates of Cologne; and retreated only on the tidings of the approach of a powerful army from Flanders. It was civil war in its most barbarous lawlessness. Bonn, Andernach, and other towns were burned; it is said that a nun was stripped naked, anointed with honey, rolled in feathers, and then set on a horse with her face to the tail, and paraded through the streets. Philip, on his side, wrought by indignation from his constitutional mildness, commanded the guilty soldiers to be boiled in hot water. The winter suspended the hostile operations.

Philip himself maintained a lofty silence towards

<sup>1</sup> "Consuetudinem illam detestabilem."

Rome; he would not, it might seem, compromise the right of election in the princes and prelates of the realm, by what might be construed into the acknowledged arbitration of a superior authority. A year had now passed; the war, on the whole, had been to his advantage; the death of Richard of England had deprived Otho of his most formidable ally. Innocent could no longer brook delay; without his aid there was danger lest the cause of Otho should utterly fail. His expectations that both parties would lay the cause at his feet were disappointed; he was compelled to take the initiative. Unsummoned therefore by general consent, appealed to by but one party, he ascended as it were his tribunal; in a letter to the Archbishop of Cologne, though by no means committing himself, he allowed his favorable disposition to transpire somewhat more clearly. In an address to the Princes and Prelates, he declared his surprise that a cause on which depended the dignity or disgrace of the Church, the peace and unity or the desolation of the Empire, had not been at once submitted to him, in whom was vested the sole and absolute right of determining the dispute in the first and last resort. It was his duty to admonish them to put an end to this fatal anarchy. He would adjudge the crown to him who should unite the greater number of suffrages, and was the best deserving.<sup>1</sup> The merits of the case were thus left to no rigid rule of right, but vaguely yielded up to his arbitrary judgment. Philip, at the same time, found it expedient to announce his election, not to submit his claim, to the Court of the Pontiff.<sup>2</sup> He wrote from the city

<sup>1</sup> Epist. i. 690; date probably May 20.

<sup>2</sup> Spires, May 28.

of Spires, that he had received with due honor the Bishop of Sutri and the Abbot of St. Anastasia, the envoys of the Pope. He had only kept them in his court to witness the course of affairs. He sent them now to announce that by God's merciful guidance all had turned out in his favor, the obstacles to his elevation were rapidly disappearing; he entreated his Holiness to turn an attentive ear to their report. At the same time came an address from the princes and prelates; the list, both of ecclesiastics and laymen, contrasted strongly with the few names which had supported the address of Otho.

Philip Augustus of France supported the demands of Philip's partisans. Among the princes were the kings of Bohemia, the dukes of Saxony, Bavaria, Austria, Meran, and Lorraine, the margraves of Meissen, Brandenburg, and Moravia. The host of prelates was even more imposing. The archbishops of Magdeburg, of Treves (who had perhaps been brought back), and Besançon; the Bishops of Ratisbon, Freisingen, Augsбург, Constance, Eichstadt, Worms, Spires, Brixen, and Hildesheim, with a large number of abbots, Herzfeld, Tegernsee, Elwangen. These had signed, but there were besides assenting to the address, Otho the palatine of Burgundy (Philip's brother), the dukes of Zähringen and Carinthia, the margraves of Landsberg and Bohberg; the palgraves of Thuringia, Witlesbach, and numberless other counts and nobles: the Patriarch of Aquileia, the Archbishop of Bremen, the Bishops of Verden, Halberstadt, Merseburg, Naumburg, Osnaburg, Bamberg, Passau, Coire, Trent, Metz, Toul, Verdun, Liège. There was submission, at the same time something of defiance and menace, in their



language. They declared that they had no design to straiten the rights of the holy see; but they urged upon the Pope that he should not encroach on the rights of the Empire; they warned him against hostility towards Markwald the seneschal of the Empire, and declared themselves ready after a short repose, with the Emperor at their head, to undertake an expedition to Rome in great force.<sup>1</sup> The Pope replied to the princes and prelates that he had heard with sorrow of the contested election; he should be prepared to join the Emperor who had been elected lawfully; he should remember rather the good than the evil deeds of the Emperor; it was by no means his desire to trench on his temporal rights, but to act for the good of the empire as of the church. They would judge better of his proceedings against Markwald, when better informed, and when they had closed their ears against the calumniators of the Roman see.

Conrad Archbishop of Mentz,<sup>2</sup> the Primate of Germany, of noble family, venerable for his age, his learning, and his character, had been absent in the Holy Land throughout all these proceedings. To him, supposing him to be yet in Palestine, Innocent addressed May 3, 1199. an epistle<sup>3</sup> which explained the state of the contest, manifestly with a strong bearing towards Otho; he declared that all his measures were for the greatness, not, as turbulent men asserted, for the destruction of

<sup>1</sup> The date of this address of the German princes and prelates is of some importance. Hurter places it in 1199. It is dated at Spire, v. Kal. Jun. May 28. Georgish in his *Regesta* assigns it to 1198; but if so, it preceded the coronation both of Otho and Philip. Von Raumer places it in his text in 1199, in his note in 1198. Boehmer in 1200.

<sup>2</sup> Conrad held the cardinal bishopric of St. Sabina, with the primacy of Mentz. — Epist. ii. 293.

<sup>3</sup> Epist. ii.

the Empire. He enjoined him to send orders to his diocese, that all the officers, the ecclesiastics, and the barons dependent on the church of Mentz, should support the Emperor approved by the Holy See. Conrad had already set out for Europe, he passed Nov. 6, 1199. through Rome; and Innocent, after a long conference, invested him in full authority to reëstablish peace in Germany. The Primate, on his part, promised to come to no final determination without sending previous information to the Pope. On the arrival of Conrad in Germany both parties consented to a suspension of arms until St. Martin's Day.

Both contending parties sent ambassadors to Innocent. Those of Otho were urgent, imploring, submissive. In every respect would the religious Otho submit himself to the wishes of the Pope. The envoys of Philip were the provost of St. Thomas at Strasburg, and a subdeacon of the Roman Church. Perhaps none of the great prelates would trust themselves or could be trusted on such a mission. To them Innocent seized the occasion of proclaiming in a full consistory of Cardinals the supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal power. The whole of the Old Testament was cited to his purpose. The subordination of the kingship to the priesthood in Melchisedec and Abraham; the inferiority of the anointed to him who anoints; even Christ the anointed, is inferior as to his manhood, to the Father by whom he is anointed. Priests are called gods, kings princes; the one have power on earth, the other in heaven; one over the soul, the other over the body; the priesthood is as much more worthy than the kingship as the soul than the body. The priesthood is older than the king-

St. James's  
day, July 25.

Embassies  
to Rome.

May 28. 1200.

ship : God gave Israel, who had long had priests, kings in his wrath. Only among the heathen was the kingdom the older ; yet even Baal, who ruled over Assyria after the building of the tower of Babel, was younger than Shem. Then came allusions to the fate of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, to the disunion of the priesthood by the wicked schismatic Jeroboam. From thence to modern times the transition was bold but easy. The happy times of Innocent II. and the Saxon Lothair and their triumph over Conrad and Anacletus were significantly adduced : “ So truth ever subdues falsehood.” The allusion to Frederick Barbarossa was even more fine and subtle. In him the Empire was united while the Church was divided ; but the schism and he who fostered the schism were stricken to the earth. Now the Church is one, the Empire divided. It concluded with the assertion that the Pope had transferred the Empire from the East to the West, that the Empire is granted as an investiture by the Pope. “ We will read the letter of your lord, we will consult with our brethren, and then give our answer ; may God enable us to act wisely for His honor, the advantage of the Church, and the welfare of the Empire.” In his reply to the princes of Germany, the leaning of Innocent against Philip, though yet slightly disguised, was more clearly betrayed. If he had the majority of voices and the possession of the regalia, on the other hand must be taken into account the illegality of his coronation, his excommunication by the Church from which he had but fraudulently obtained absolution ; the design to make the Empire hereditary in his house. The Archbishop of Cologne was arraigned in no moderate terms for presuming to submit the question to the

diet of the Empire without the Pope's previous consent.<sup>1</sup>

The assembly at Boppard in the previous year had come to nothing. Otho only appeared, neither Philip nor his supporters condescended to notice the summons. Again the war broke out, and raged with all June, 1199.

its ferocity. Philip fell on the hereditary territories of the house of Guelf. The Archbishop of Magdeburg burned Helmstadt; Henry, the brother of Otho, ravaged the bishopric of Hildesheim, and threw himself into Brunswick, now besieged by Philip. Philip was obliged to withdraw with great loss and dishonor; he returned to the Rhine, where his ally the Bishop of Worms was wasting the country round his Oct. 27.

own city; he obtained a powerful ally in Conrad of Scharfenech, the coadjutor of the Bishop of Spire. The death of the peaceful Primate, Conrad of Mentz, destroyed all hopes, if hopes there were, of composing the strife by amicable negotiation. A double election for the primacy was the inevitable consequence of the all-pervading conflict. Hardly were the last obsequies paid to the remains of Conrad when the Chapter met. Both the elected prelates were men of noble German race. The partisans of Philip chose Leopold of the house of Schonfeld, who had succeeded his uncle in the See of Worms. Leopold was a churchman, strong in mind, strong in body, vigorous and violent; no less distinguished for the qualities of a warlike leader than an able prelate; he had been engaged in the Italian wars, and at least had not restrained his soldiers in the plunder of churches: his enemies described him as a tyrant rather than a bishop; and such was his daring

<sup>1</sup> Epist. vol. i. p. 691.

that he is said, somewhat later, with all the pomp of burning torches, to have excommunicated the Pope himself.<sup>1</sup> The opposite party elected Siegfried, of the house of Eppstein, but Mentz being in possession of their adversaries, they withdrew to Bingen to confirm their election.

Innocent now determined to assume openly the function of supreme arbiter in this great quarrel. Pope Innocent's deliberation. The Cardinal Guido Pierleoni, Bishop of Palestrina, appeared in Germany with a Bull containing the full and elaborate judgment. This was the tenor of the Bull:—“It belongs to the Apostolic See to pass judgment on the election of the Emperor, both in the first and last resort;<sup>2</sup> in the first, because by her aid and on her account the Empire was transplanted from Constantinople; by her as the sole authority for this transplanting, on her behalf and for her better protection: in the last resort, because the Emperor receives the final confirmation of his dignity from the Pope; is consecrated, crowned, invested in the imperial dignity by him. That which must be sought is the lawful, the right, the expedient.” Innocent proceeds to discuss at length the claims of the three kings,<sup>3</sup> the child (Frederick of Sicily), Philip, and Otho. He admits the lawful election, the oath twice taken, and once at least freely, by the Princes of the Empire to

<sup>1</sup> Cæsar, Heisterb. Dialog. Mirac. ii. 9.

<sup>2</sup> It was the Emperor, not the King of the Germans. Innocent, in theory, held to this distinction. The Germans had full right to choose their king, but their king, being also by established usage Emperor, came under the direct cognizance of the Pope. — Epist. i. 697.

<sup>3</sup> According to M. Abel (Philip der Hohenstauffer), the *Deliberatio* was not a published document; at all events it contains the views and reasonings of Innocent. The results were to be communicated to the Princes of the Empire by his Legates.



the young Frederick. "His cause it might seem incumbent on the Apostolic See, as the protector of the orphan, to maintain; and lest, when come to riper years, in his wrath at having been deprived of the Empire by the Papal decree, he should become hostile to the Pope and withdraw the kingdom of Naples from her allegiance to the Holy See. But, on the other hand, on whom did this election fall? to whom was this oath sworn? To one not merely incapable of ruling the Empire, but of doing anything; a child of two years old, a child not yet baptized." The Deliberation enlarges on the utter unfitness of a child for such a high office in such perilous times. "Woe unto the realm, saith the Scripture, whose king is a child. Dangerous, too, were it to the Church to unite the Empire with the kingdom of Sicily. Yet never will Frederick in riper years be able justly to reproach the See of Rome with having robbed him of his Empire; it is his own uncle who will have deprived him of that crown, of his paternal inheritance, and who is even endeavoring by his myrmidons to despoil him of his mother's kingdom, did not the holy Church keep watch and ward over his rights.<sup>1</sup>

"Neither can any objection be raised against the legality of the election of Philip. It rests upon the gravity, the dignity, the number of those who chose him. It may appear vindictive, and therefore unbecoming in us, because his father and his brother have been persecutors of the church, to visit their sins on him. He is mighty too in territory, in wealth, in people; is it not to swim against the stream to provoke the

<sup>1</sup> Remark this provident anticipation of Frederick's future cause of quarrel with the See of Rome, and the blame cast on his relative.

enmity of the powerful against the Church, we who, if we favored Philip, might enjoy that peace which it is our duty to ensue?

“Yet is it right that we should declare against him. Our predecessors have excommunicated him, justly, solemnly, and canonically: justly, because he has violently seized the patrimony of St. Peter; solemnly, in St. Peter’s church on a high festivity during the sacrifice of the mass. He has obtained absolution, it is true, from our Legate, the Bishop of Sutri, but in direct contradiction to our express commands. Besides he is under the ban pronounced against Markwald and all, Germans as well as Italians, who are his partisans. It is moreover notorious that he swore fealty to the child; he is guilty therefore of perjury: he may allege that we have declared that oath null; but the Israelites, when they would be released from their oath concerning Gibeon, first consulted the Lord; so should he first have consulted us, who can alone absolve from oaths. But if father shall succeed to son, brother to brother, the Empire ceases to be elective, it becomes hereditary; and in what house would the Empire be perpetuated? — a house in which one persecutor of the church succeeds to another. The first Henry who rose to the Empire (the Pope goes back to king Henry V., with whom the Hohenstaufen had but remote connection), violently and perfidiously laid hands on Pope Paschal, of holy memory, who had crowned him; imprisoned him with his cardinals, whom he threatened to murder, until Paschal, in fear for Henry not for himself, appeased the madman by concession. The said Henry chose an heresiarch as an Antipope, set up an idol against the Church of Rome, so that the schism lasted

till the time of Pope Calixtus. From this house came Frederick, who promised to subdue the rebellious Tiburtines to the See of Rome, but retained them as liegemen of the Empire, and threatened our ancestor the Chancellor Alexander, who asserted the rights of St. Peter, that if it were in the church of St. Peter he should feel how sharp-edged were the swords of the Germans; who plotted to dethrone Pope Hadrian, alleging that he was the son of a priest; who fomented a long schism against Alexander; deceived and besieged Pope Lucius in Verona. His son and successor Henry was accursed even on his accession, for he invaded and wasted the lands of St. Peter, and in contempt of the Church cut off the noses of some of the servants of our brother. He took the murderers of Bishop Albert among his followers, and bestowed large fiefs upon them. He caused the Bishop of Osimo, because he declared that he held his see of the apostolic throne, to be struck on the mouth, to have his beard plucked out, with other shameless indignities. By his commands Conrad put our honored brother the Bishop of Ostia in chains, and rewarded his sacrilege with lands and honors; he prohibited all appeals from the clergy to Rome throughout the kingdom of Sicily. As to Philip himself, he has ever been an obstinate persecutor of the church; he called himself Duke of Tuscany and Campania, and claimed all the lands up to the gates of the city; he is endeavoring even now by the support of Markwald and of Diephold to deprive us of our kingdom of Sicily. If, while his power was yet unripe, he so persecuted the holy church, what would he do if Emperor? It behooves us to oppose him before he has reached his full strength. That the sins

of the father are visited on the sons, we know from holy writ, we know from many examples, Saul, Jeroboam, Baasha." The Pope exhausts the Old Testament in his precedents.

"Now, as to Otho. It may seem not just to favor his cause because he was chosen but by a minority; not becoming, because it may seem that the Apostolic chair acts not so much from good-will towards him, as from hatred of the others; not expedient because he is less powerful. But as the Lord abases the proud, and lifts up the humble, as he raised David to the throne, so it is just, befitting, expedient, that we bestow our favor upon Otho. Long enough have we delayed, and labored for unity by our letters and our envoys; it seems us no longer to appear as if we were waiting the issue of events, as if like Peter we were denying the truth which is Christ; we must therefore publicly declare ourselves for Otho, himself devoted to the Church, of a race devoted to the church, by his mother's side from the royal house of England, by his father from the Duke of Saxony, all, especially his ancestor the Emperor Lothair, the loyal sons of the Church; him, therefore, we proclaim, acknowledge as king; him then we summon to take on himself the imperial crown."

Innocent, now committed in the strife, plunged into it with all the energy and activity of his character. To every order, to the archbishops, bishops and clergy, to the princes and nobles, to every distinguished individual, the Archbishops of Cologne and Magdeburg, the Archbishop of Aquileia, the Palgrave of the Rhine, the Landgrave of Thuringia, the King of Bohemia, the Counts of Flanders and of Brabant, were addressed letters from the See of Rome, admonitory, persuasive,

or encouraging, according to their attachment or aversion to the cause of Otho. The Legate in France had directions to break off, if possible, the alliance of Philip Augustus with the Duke of Swabia :<sup>1</sup> John of England was urged to take more active measures in favor of Otho ; the Cardinal Bishop of Palestrina crossed the Alps with his co-legate the Brother Philip ; he had an interview in Champagne with January, March. the legate in France, the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia. They proceeded to Liège, from thence to Aix-la-Chapelle. At Neuss Otho appeared before the three Papal legates, and took an oath of fidelity to the Pope couched in the strongest terms. He swore to maintain all the territories, fiefs, and rights of the See of Rome, granted by all the Emperors downwards, from Louis the Pious ; to maintain the Pope in the possessions which he now holds, to assist him in obtaining those which he does not now occupy ; to render the Pope that honor and obedience which has ever been rendered by the pious Catholic Emperors. He swore to conduct himself as to the affairs of the Roman people, the Lombard and Tuscan leagues, according to the Pope's counsel, as also in any treaty of peace with the King of France. "If on my account the Church of Rome is involved in war, I will aid it with money. This oath shall be renewed both by word of mouth and in writing when I shall receive the imperial crown." The Legate proclaims Otho. The Cardinal Guido departed to Cologne ; June 8, 1201. in the name of Innocent he proclaimed Otho Em-

<sup>1</sup> Rather later the Pope endeavors to alarm Philip Augustus. Philip (the Emperor), he says, had claimed the guardianship of Frederick II. and the possession of Sicily. If he had gained this "in superbiam elatus aliud cogitaret, et *regnum* Francorum sibi disponderet subjugare, sicut olim disposuerat frater ejus Henricus." — Epist. i. 717. Did Innocent believe this?



peror, amid the applause of Otho's partisans. He awaited the concourse of prelates and nobles which he had summoned to Cologne: few came; some even of the bishops closed their doors against the messengers of the Legate. Again he summoned them to Corvey, and began to threaten the interdict. From thence he went to Bingen, where he spoke more openly of the interdict. From Bingen letters were written to the Pope, describing the progress of Otho's affairs as triumphant. "Nothing now is heard of Philip and his few partisans; with him as under God's displeasure everything fails, he can gather no army; while Otho will soon appear at the head of 100,000 men." The Cardinal could hardly intend to deceive the Pope, he was no doubt himself deceived.

At that very time were assembled at Bamberg, the Archbishops of Magdeburg and Bremen, the Bishops of Worms, Passau, Ratisbon, Constance, Augsburg, Eichstadt, Havelberg, Brandenburg, Meissen, Naumburg, and Bamberg; the Abbots of Fulda, Herzfeld, and Kempten; the King of Bohemia, the Dukes of Saxony, Austria, Steyermark, Meran, Zahrigen, the "Stadtholder of Burgundy," and a number of other princes. They expressed themselves in terms of which the contemptuousness was but lightly veiled. They refused to believe (reason would not admit, loyal simplicity would not believe) that the unseemly language which the Bishop of Palestrina, who gave himself out as the Legate of the Pope, presumed to hold regarding the Empire, had been authorized by the admirable wisdom of the Pope, or the honored conclave of the Cardinals. "Who has ever heard of such presumption? What

June 29.  
Otho's Diet  
at Cologne.

Sept. 8, 1201.

Philip's  
Diet at  
Bamberg.

proof can be adduced for pretensions, of which history, authentic documents, and even fable itself is silent? Where have ye read, ye Popes! where have ye heard, ye Cardinals! that your predecessors or your legates have dared to mingle themselves up with the election of a king of the Romans, either as electors, or as judges? The election of the Pope indeed required the assent of the Emperor, till Henry I. in his generosity removed that limitation. How dares his holiness the Pope to stretch forth his hand to seize that which belongs not to him? There is no higher council in a contested election for the Empire, than the Princes of the Empire. Jesus Christ had separated spiritual from temporal affairs. He who serves God should not mingle in worldly matters; he who aims at worldly power is unworthy of spiritual supremacy. Punish, therefore, most holy Father, the Bishop of Palestrina for his presumption, acknowledge Philip whom we have chosen, and, *as it is your duty*, prepare to crown him."

Innocent replied in somewhat less dictatorial and imperious language; "it was not his intention Nov. 2. to interfere with the rights of the electors, but it was his right, his duty, to examine and to prove the fitness of him whom he had solemnly to consecrate and to crown."<sup>1</sup> His Legates had instructions to proceed with the greatest caution, to pause before they proclaimed the direct excommunication of the great prelates of the realm. These prelates were already under the ban, which comprehended the partisans of Philip.

<sup>1</sup> Non enim elegimus nos personam, sed electo ab eorum parte majori (Innocent had up to this time acknowledged the election of Otho to have been by a minority) qui vocem habere in imperatoris electione noseuntur, et ubi debuit, et a quo debuit coronato, favorem præstitimus et præstamus. — Epist. i. 711.

But of the virtual or direct excommunication they were equally contemptuous: not a prelate was estranged from Philip or attached to Otho, by the terror of the Papal censures. This array of almost all the great ecclesiastics of Germany against the Pope during this whole contest is remarkable, but intelligible enough. Almost all the richer and more powerful Bishoprics were held by sons or kinsmen of the noble houses; they were German princes as well as German prelates. The survey of the order shows at once the ecclesiastical state of the realm, and unfolds the nature of the strife. The rivals for the Primacy, the Archbishopric of Mentz, were both of noble houses — Leopold of the house of Schonfeld, Siegfried of that of Eppstein. Leopold's ambition was to retain the Bishopric of Worms with that of Mentz. The Pope at once repudiated this monstrous demand, irrespective of the ulterior claims to the Primacy, which he adjudged to Siegfried. But the Chapter of Mentz, with three exceptions, were for Leopold and Philip (it was the same cause to them). Mentz long refused to open her gates to the Pope's Primate. Leopold, warlike, enterprising, restless, seems to have nourished a mortal hatred to Innocent; he threw back, as has been said, the ban of the Pope, and solemnly excommunicated the successor of St. Peter; and at length, leaving both the See to which he aspired and that which he actually possessed, he descended into Italy, in order to instigate the cities of Romagna to throw off the Papal yoke. The banner of the Archbishop of Mentz floated in the van of the anti-Papal army. In many of these cities the Bishop of Worms met with success; and hence, when after the death of Philip a general amnesty was granted

to his civil and ecclesiastical partisans, Leopold only was excluded, and abandoned to the vengeance of the Pope. Such was the state of the Primacy; like the Empire, an object of fierce and irreconcilable strife. The Archbishop of Treves, timid, avaricious, and time-serving, was on the side which paid him best. He had been inclined to Otho, then fell off to Philip. At one time he offered to resign his See, and then, being supported by the inhabitants of Treves, declared for Philip. He was excommunicated by the Legate; the Archbishop of Cologne empowered to seize his domains; yet even when he was bought to the party of Philip, he made excuses to elude a public meeting and acknowledgment of the Emperor. Adolph, Archbishop of Cologne, had raised Otho to the Empire, crowned him in Aix-la-Chapelle; he had been the soul of the confederacy; but already there were dark rumors of his treachery and meditated revolt. That revolt took place at length; but wealthy Cologne repudiated her perfidious Prelate, maintained her fidelity to Otho, declared Adolph deposed, and elected a new Prelate, the Bishop of Bonn. The Archbishop of Salzburg was for Philip; he was held in such high respect that to him was intrusted the protestation of the Diet of Bamberg; he alone, at a later period, seemed worked upon by the Papal influence to incline somewhat more to the cause of Otho. The Archbishop of Bremen in his remote diocese contented himself with a more quiet support of Philip; the Archbishop of Magdeburg was unmoved alike by the friendly overtures of Innocent, and by the excommunication of the Legate. The Archbishop of Besançon received Philip with the utmost pomp, led him to his

cathedral, and gave him all the honors of an Emperor. The Archbishop of Tarantaise had officiated at the coronation of Philip. The Bishops of Bamberg, Halberstadt, Spire, Passau, Eichstadt, Freisingen openly showed their contempt for the Papal mandates; the three latter, in defiance of the Pope, maintained the right of the Bishop of Worms to the Primacy. The Bishop of Spire seized two servants of the Pope, imprisoned one and threatened to hang the other. The Archbishops of Besançon and Tarantaise, the Bishops of Spire and Passau were cited to Rome to answer for their conduct; they paid not the least regard to the summons. The murder of the Bishop of Wurtzburg is a more frightful illustration of the state of things. Conrad of Rabensberg was related by his mother to the house of Hohenstaufen; he had been appointed Chancellor of the Empire by Henry. He was on his way to the Crusade, when he heard that the Chapter of Hildesheim had chosen him their Bishop. He fulfilled his vow. On his return he found that he had been elected Bishop of Wurtzburg. Conrad was tempted by the wealthier see, which was in the neighborhood of the house of his race. He would willingly have retained both. So important was his support to Philip, that he was confirmed in the office of Chancellor, and received the gift of the castle of Sternberg. Innocent ordered the Archbishop of Mentz to take possession of the estates of Wurtzburg; issued injunctions to the Archbishop of Magdeburg to interdict Conrad in the diocese of Hildesheim, and to command the Chapter to proceed to a new election. Yet there were secret intimations, that a man of his high character and position might find favor in Rome. To Rome he



went ; he returned Bishop of Wurtzburg ; and if not now an opponent, but a lukewarm partisan of Philip. He was threatened with the loss of his dignity as Chancellor,<sup>1</sup> perhaps became the object of persecution. His murder was an act of private revenge. He had determined to put down the robbers and disturbers of the peace round Wurtzburg. One of the house of Rabensberg presumed on his relationship to claim an exception from this decree : he was beheaded by the inflexible Conrad. The kinsman of the exe- Dec. 3, 1202. cuted robber, Bodo of Rabensberg, and Henry Hund of Falkenberg, resented this act of unusual severity. Two of their followers stole into Wurtzburg, murdered the Bishop on his way to church, and mutilated his body. When Philip came to Wurtzburg, the clergy and people showed him the hand of the murdered Bishop and demanded vengeance.<sup>2</sup> Philip gave no redress : he was charged with more than indifference to the fate of a Bishop who had fallen off to Otho. The citizens broke out, took and razed the castles of the suborners of the murder. These men fled to Rome, confessed their sin, and submitted to penance.<sup>3</sup> The penance is characteristic of the age ; it was a just but life-long martyrdom. They were to show themselves naked, as far as decency would permit, and with a halter round their necks, in the cathedral of every city in Germany, through which lay their way from Rome, till they reached Wurtzburg. There, on the four great feasts, and on the day of St. Kilian the tute-

<sup>1</sup> Compare Innocent's letters. — Reg. i. 201 ; i. 223. He is called Chancellor at the time of his murder.

<sup>2</sup> Arnold Lubec. — Leibnitz, ii. 726.

<sup>3</sup> Raynald. sub ann. 1203.

lar saint of the city, they must appear and undergo the discipline of flagellation. They might not bear arms, but against the enemies of the faith, nor wear rich attire. Four years they were to serve, but in the garb of penitence, in the Holy Land. All their life they were to fast and pray, to receive the Eucharist only on their death-bed.<sup>1</sup>

For ten dreary years, with but short intervals of truce, Germany was abandoned to all the horrors of civil war.<sup>2</sup> The repeated protestations of Innocent, that he was not the cause of these fatal discords, betray the fact that he was accused of the guilt; and that he had to wrestle with his own conscience to acquit himself of the charge. It was a war not of decisive battles, but of marauding, desolation, havoc, plunder, wasting of harvests, ravaging open and defenceless countries; war waged by Prelate against Prelate, by Prince against

Ten years' war.  
A.D. 1198-1208.

<sup>1</sup> The inscription on the place of the murder —

Hic procumbo solo, sceleri quia parcere nolo,  
Vulnera facta dolo dant habitare polo.

*Eöhmer, Fontes. i. 36.*

<sup>2</sup> Thus says Walther der Vogelweide —

Zu Rom hört ich lügen,  
Zwei könige betrügen;  
Das gab den aller-grösten Streit,  
Der jemals ward in aller Zeit,  
Da sah man sich entzweien  
Die Pfaffen und die Laien.  
Die Noth war über alle Noth;  
Da lagen Leib und Seele todt.  
Die Pfaffen wurden Krieger,  
Die Laien blieben Sieger,  
Das Schwert sie legten aus der Hand,  
Und griffen zu der Stola Band,  
Sie bannten wen sie wollten,  
Nicht den sie bannen sollten.  
Zerstört war manches Göttes haus.

*Simrock, p. 174; Lachmann, 9; Hurter, ii. 98.*

Prince ; wild Bohemians and bandit soldiers of every race were roving through every province. Throughout the land there was no law : the high roads were impassable on account of robbers ; traffic cut off, except on the great rivers from Cologne down the Rhine, from Ratisbon down the Danube ; nothing was spared, nothing sacred, church or cloister. Some monasteries were utterly impoverished, some destroyed. The ferocities of war grew into brutalities ; the clergy, and sacred persons, were the victims and perpetrators. The wretched nun, whose ill-usage has been related, was no doubt only recorded because her fate was somewhat more horrible than that of many of her sisters. The Abbot of St. Gall seized six of the principal burghers of Arbon, and cut off their feet, in revenge for one of his servants, who had suffered the like mutilation for lopping wood in their forests.

Innocent seemed threatened with the deep humiliation of having provoked, inflamed, kept up this disastrous strife only for his own and his Emperor's discomfiture and defeat. Year after year the cause of Otho became more doubtful ; the exertions, the intrigues, the promises, the excommunications of Rome became more unavailing. The revolt of the Archbishop of Cologne gave a fatal turn : <sup>1</sup> the example of Adolph's perfidy and tergiversation wrought widely among Otho's most powerful partisans. There were few, on Otho's side at least, who had not changed their party ; Otho's losses were feebly compensated by the defections from the ranks of Philip. At the close of the ten years the

Innocent  
obliged to  
acknowledge  
Philip.

Nov. 11,  
1201.

<sup>1</sup> Two grants ( Böhmer's Regesta sub ann. 1205) show the price paid for the archbishop's perfidy.

contest had become almost hopeless; even the inflexible Innocent was compelled to betray signs of remorse, of reconciliation, of accepting Philip as Emperor, of abandoning Otho,<sup>1</sup> of recanting all his promises, and struggling out of his vows of implacable enmity and of perpetual alliance. Negotiations had begun, Philip's  
 June, 1206. ambassadors were received in Rome: two Legates, Leo, the Cardinal Priest of Santa Croce, Cardinal Ugolino Bishop of Ostia and Velletri, were in Worms: Philip swore to subject himself in all  
 Aug. 1207. things to the Pope. Philip was solemnly ab-  
 Christmas. 1207. solved from his excommunication. At Metz the Papal Legates beheld the victorious Emperor celebrate his Christmas with kingly splendor.<sup>2</sup> From this abasing position Innocent was relieved by the  
 Murder of Philip. crime of one man. The assassination of Philip by Otho of Wittlesbach placed Otho at once on the throne.

The crime of Otho of Wittlesbach sprang from private revenge. Otho was one of the fiercest and most lawless chieftains of those lawless times; brave beyond most men, and so far true and loyal to the house of Swabia. Philip had at least closed his eyes at one murder committed by Otho of Wittlesbach. He had

<sup>1</sup> Compare Otho's desperate letter of covert reproach to Innocent, Epist. i. 754. Innocent's letter to the Archbishop of Salzburg betrays something like shame, i. 748. In 1205 Innocent reproached the bishops and prelates of Otho's party — *ex eo quod nobilis vir Dux Suecie visus est aliquantulum prosperare, contra honestatem propriam et fidem præstitam venientes, relicto eo cui prius adhæserant, ejus adversario adherent.* — Epist. i. 742. The Guelfic author of the *Chronicon Placentinum* (edited under the auspices of the Duke de Luyne, Paris, 1856) boldly accuses Innocent of corruption: *audiens illum potentem esse sine timore ipsius, auro et argento corruptus, &c., p. 30.*

<sup>2</sup> Reg. Imp. Chron. Ursberg. — Epist. i. 750, of Nov. 1. Compare Abel. Philip. der Hohenstauffer, p. 211.

promised him his daughter in marriage ; but the father's gentle heart was moved ; he alleged some impediment of affinity to release her from the union with this wild man. Otho then aspired to the daughter of the Duke of Poland. He demanded letters of recommendation from the King Philip. He set forth with them, but some mistrust induced him to have them opened and read ; he found that Philip had, generously to the Duke of Poland, perfidiously as he thought to himself, warned the Duke as to the ungovernable character of Otho. He vowed vengeance. On St. Alban's day Philip at Bamberg had been celebrating the nuptials of his niece with the Duke of Meran. He was reposing, having been bled, in the heat of the day, on a couch in the palace of the Bishop. Otho appeared with sixteen followers at the door, and demanded audience as on some affair of importance ; he entered the chamber brandishing his sword. " Lay down that sword," said Philip, with the scornful reproach of perfidy : Wittelsbach struck Philip on the neck. Three persons were present, the Chancellor, the Truchsess of Waldburg, and an officer of the royal chamber. The Chancellor ran to hide himself, the other two endeavored to seize Otho ; the Truchsess bore an honorable scar for life, which he received in his attempt to bolt the door. Otho passed out, leaped on his horse, and fled. So died the gentlest, the most popular of the house of Swabia.<sup>1</sup> The execration of all mankind, the

<sup>1</sup> Philip had been compelled during the long war grievously to weaken the power of his house by alienating the domains which his predecessors had accumulated. *Hic cum non haberet pecunias quibus salaria sive solda præberet militibus, primus cœpit distrahere prædia, quæ pater suus Fredericus imperator late acquisierat in Alemanniâ; sicque factum est ut nihil sibi remaneret præter inane nomen dominii terræ, et curtiales seu villas in*



ban of the Empire pursued the murderer. The castle of Wittlesbach was levelled with the ground, not one stone left on another: on its site was built a church, dedicated to the Virgin. The assassin was at length discovered in a stable, after many wanderings and it is said after deep remorse of mind, and put to death with many wounds.

quibus fora habentur et pauca castella terræ. — Chron. Ursberg. 311. The poems of Walther der Vogelweide are the best testimony to the gentleness and popularity of Philip. See *der Pfaffen Wahl*, p. 180; especially *Die Milde*, 184. Simrock.

## CHAPTER III.

## INNOCENT AND THE EMPEROR OTHO IV.

OTHO was now undisputed Emperor ; a diet at Frankfort, more numerous than had met <sup>Otho</sup> for many years, acknowledged him with <sup>Emperor.</sup> almost unprecedented unanimity. He held great diets at Nuremberg, Brunswick, Wurtzburg, Spire. He descended the next year over the Brenner into Italy to receive the Imperial crown. Throughout Italy the Guelfic cities opened their gates to welcome the Champion of the Church, the Emperor chosen by the Pope, with universal acclamation : old enemies seemed to forget their feuds in his presence, tributary gifts were poured lavishly at his feet.

The Pope and his Emperor met at Viterbo ; they embraced, they wept tears of joy, in remembrance of their common trials, in transport at their common triumph. Innocent's compulsory abandonment of Otho's cause was forgotten : the Pope demanded security that Otho would surrender, immediately after his coronation, the lands of the Church, now occupied by his troops. Otho almost resented the suspicion of his loyalty ; and Innocent in his blind confidence abandoned his demand.

The coronation took place in St. Peter's church with more than usual magnificence and so- Oct. 24.

lemnity ; magnificence which became this unwonted friendship between the temporal and spiritual powers ; solemnity which was enhanced by the lofty character and imposing demeanor of Innocent. The Imperial crown was on the head of Otho ; and — almost from that moment the Emperor and the Pope were implacable enemies. Otho has at once forgotten his own prodigal acknowledgment : “ All I have been, all I am, all I ever shall be, after God, I owe to you and the Church.”<sup>1</sup> Already the evening before the coronation, an ill-omened strife had arisen between the populace of Rome and the German soldiery : the Bishop of Augsburg had been mishandled by the rabble. That night broke out a fiercer fray ; much blood was shed ; so furious was the attack of the Romans even on the German knights, that 1100 horses are set down as the loss of Otho’s army : the number of men killed does not appear. Otho withdrew in wrath from the city ; he demanded redress of the Pope, which Innocent was probably less able than willing to afford. After some altercation by messengers on each side, they had one more friendly interview, the last, in the camp of Otho.

The Emperor marched towards Tuscany ; took possession of the cities on the frontier of the territory of the Countess Matilda, Montefiascone, Acquapendente, Radicofani.<sup>2</sup> He summoned the magistrates and the learned in the law, and demanded their judg-

<sup>1</sup> Quod hactenus fuimus, quod sumus et quod erimus . . . totum vobis et Romanæ ecclesiæ post Deum debere . . . gratantissime recognoscimus — Regest. Ep. 161.

<sup>2</sup> Chronic. Ursberg. Ric. de S. Germ. spreto juramento. At Spire (March 22) Otho had solemnly guaranteed the patrimony of St. Peter. — Epist. Innocent. i. 762.

ment as to the rights of the Emperor to the inheritance of the Countess Matilda. They declared that the Emperor had abandoned those rights in ignorance, that the Emperor might resume them at any time. He entered Tuscany: Sienna, San Miniato, Florence, Lucca, before all, Ghibelline Pisa, opened their gates.<sup>1</sup> He conferred privileges or established ancient rights. He proceeded to the Dukedom of Spoleto, Dec. 24. in which he invested Berthold, one of his followers. Diephold came from the south of Italy to offer his allegiance; he received as a reward the principality of Salerno. Otho attempted Viterbo. He had his emissaries to stir up again the imperial faction in Rome. He cut off all communication with Rome; even ecclesiastics proceeding on their business to the Pope were robbed. Vain were the most earnest appeals to his gratitude, even the most earnest expostulations, the most awful admonitions, excommunication itself. Otho had learned that, when on his own side, Papal censures, Papal interdicts might be defied with impunity.

After all his labors, after all his hazards, after all his sacrifices, after all his perils, even his humiliations, Innocent had raised up to himself a more formidable antagonist, a more bitter foe than even the proudest and most ambitious of the Hohenstaufen. Otho openly laid claim to the kingdom of Apulia; master of Tuscany and Romagna, at peace with the Lombard League, he seized Orvieto, Perugia. He prepared, he

<sup>1</sup> Otho's acts are dated in almost every great city in Italy — Florence, Lucca, Pisa, Terni, Ravenna, Ferrara, Parma, Milan, Pavia, Lodi, Brescia, Vercelli, Piacenza, Modena, Todi, Reate, Sora, Capua, Aversa, Veroli, Bologna.

actually commenced a war for the subjugation of Naples. The galleys of Pisa and Genoa were at his command; Diephold and others of the old German warriors, settled in the kingdom of Apulia, entered into his alliance.

His successes in the kingdom of Naples but inflamed his ambition; he would now add Sicily to his dominions, and expel the young Frederick, the last of the house of Hohenstaufen. It might seem almost in A.D. 1211. despair that Innocent at length, on Holy Thursday,<sup>1</sup> uttered the solemn excommunication: he commanded the Patriarchs of Grado and Aquileia, the Archbishops of Ravenna, Milan, and Genoa, and all the Bishops of Italy to publish the ban. Otho treated this last act of sovereign spiritual authority with utter indifference. Everything seemed to menace Innocent, and even the Papal power itself. In Rome insurrection seemed brooding for an outbreak; while Innocent himself was preaching on a high festival, John Capocio, one of his old adversaries, broke the respectful silence:—"Thy words are God's words, thy acts the acts of the devil!"

But Otho knew not how far reached the power of Innocent and of the Church. While Italy seemed to submit to his sway, his throne in Germany was crumbling into dust. For nearly three years, Aug. 1209. March. 1212. three years of unwonted peace, he had been absent from Germany. But he left in Germany an unfavorable impression of his pride, and of his insatiable thirst for wealth and power. Siegfried Archbishop

<sup>1</sup> According to some accounts it was uttered, perhaps threatened, on the octave of St. Martin (Nov. 18, 1210.) — Chronic. Ursberg. Ric. de San Germ.



of Mentz, more grateful to the Pope than Otho, for his firm protection in his days of weakness and disaster, accepted the legatine commission, and with the legatine commission, orders to publish the excommunication throughout Germany. The kindred, the friends of the Hohenstaufen, heard with joy that the Pope had been roused out of his infatuated attachment to their enemy; rumors were industriously spread abroad that Otho meditated a heavy taxation of the Empire, not excepting the lands of the monasteries; that as he had expressed himself contemptuously of the clergy, refusing them their haughty titles, he now proposed to enact sumptuary laws to limit their pomp. The archbishop was to travel but with twelve horses, the bishop with six, the abbot with three. By rapid degrees grew up a formidable confederacy, of which Innocent no doubt had instant intelligence, of which his influence was the secret moving power. Even in Italy there were some cities already in open hostility, in declared alliance with Innocent and Frederick. At Lodi Otho declared Genoa, Cremona, Ferrara, the Margrave Azzo under the ban of the Empire.<sup>1</sup> At Nurem-<sup>Ascension</sup>berg met the Primate and the Archbishop of <sup>Day.</sup> Treves venturing for once on a bold measure, the Archbishop of Magdeburg, the Chancellor of the Empire, the Bishop of Spire, the Bishop of Basle, the Landgrave of Thuringia, the King of Bohemia, and all the other nobles attached to the house of Swabia. They inveighed against the pride of Otho, his ingratitude and hostility to the Pope; on the internal wars which again threatened the peace of Germany. The

<sup>1</sup> Francisc. Pepin. Murat. ix. 640. Galvan. Flamma, xi. 664. Sicard. Crem. vii. p. 813.

only remedy was his deposal, and the choice of another Emperor. That Emperor must be the young Frederick of Sicily, the heir of the great house, whom in evil hour they had dispossessed of the succession: to him they had sworn allegiance in his cradle, to the violation of that oath might be attributed much of the afflictions and disasters of the realm. Two brave and  
A.D. 1211. loyal Swabian knights, Anselm of Justingen and Henry of Niffen, were deputed and amply furnished with funds, to invite the young Frederick to resume his ancestral throne.

Anselm and his companions arrived at Rome. Innocent dissembled his joy; <sup>1</sup> he hesitated indeed to become a Ghibelline Pope; he could not but remember the ancient, rooted, inveterate oppugnancy of the house of Hohenstaufen to the See of Rome. But fear and resentment for the ingratitude of Otho prevailed; he  
Oct. 1211. might hope that Frederick would respect the guardianship of the Pope, guardianship which had exercised but questionable care over its ward. The Swabians passed on to Palermo; they communicated the message of the diet at Nuremberg; they laid the Empire before the feet of Frederick, now but seventeen years old. Frederick even at that age seemed to unite the romantic vivacity of the Italian, and the gallantry of his Norman race, with something of German intrepidity; he had all the accomplishments, and all the knowledge of the day; he spoke Latin, Italian, German, French, Greek, Arabic; he was a poet: how could he resist such an offer? There was the imperial crown to be won by bold adventure; revenge on Otho, who had threatened to invade his kingdom of

<sup>1</sup> Qui licet hoc bene vellet, tamen dissimulavit. — Rigord.

Sicily; the restoration of his ancestral house to all its ancestral grandeur. The tender remonstrances of his wife,<sup>1</sup> who bore at this time his first-born son; the grave counsels of the Sicilian nobles, reluctant that Sicily should become a province of the Empire, who warned him against the perfidy of the Germans, the insecure fidelity of the Pope, were alike without effect.<sup>2</sup> He hastened to desert his sunny Palermo for cold Germany; to leave his gay court for a life of wild enterprise; all which was so congenial to the natural impulses of his character, to war with his age, which he was already beyond. Ever after Frederick looked back upon his beloved Sicily with fond regret; there, whenever he could, he established his residence, it was his own native realm, the home of his affections, of his enjoyments.

The Emperor Otho heard of the proceedings in Germany; he hurried with all speed to repress the threatening revolt.<sup>3</sup> As he passed through Italy, he could not but remark the general estrangement; almost everywhere his reception was sullen, cold, compulsorily hospitable.<sup>4</sup> The whole land was prepared to fall off. Appalling contrast to his triumphant journey but two or three years before! In Germany it was still more

<sup>1</sup> Frederick had been married *at fifteen* to Constantia, widow of K. Emeric of Hungary, daughter of Alfonso King of Arragon, in Aug. 1209. Henry VII. was born early in 1212.

<sup>2</sup> Chronic. Ursberg. Chron. Foss. Nov. Murat. vii. 887.

<sup>3</sup> Otho cum totam fere sibi Apuliam subjugasset, audito quod quidam Italiæ principes ibi rebellaverant mandato apostolico, regnum festinus egreditur mense Novembris. — Ric. S. Germ. Chron. Foss. Nov. Francisc. Pepin.

<sup>4</sup> Gravis Italicis, Alemannis gravior, fines attingit Alemanniæ; a nullo uti principi occurritur, nulli gratus excipitur. — Conrad de Fabaria, Canon. S. Galli, Pertz, xi. p. 170. The author, a monk of S. Gall, describes Frederick's reception at his monastery.

gloomy and threatening. He summoned a diet at

March 4,  
1212.

Frankfort ; eighty nobles of all orders assembled, one bishop, the Bishop of Halberstadt.<sup>1</sup>

Siegfried of Mentz, now Papal Legate, with Albert of Magdeburg, declared the Archbishop of Cologne, Dietrich of Heinsberg, deposed from his see under the pretext of his oppression of the clergy and the monks.

Feb. 27, 1211. Adolph, the former archbishop, the most powerful friend, the most traitorous enemy of Otho, appeared in the city, was welcomed with open arms by the clergy, and resumed the see, as he declared, with the sanction of the Pope. War, desolating lawless war, broke out again throughout Germany. The

Duke of Brabant, on Otho's retreat, surprised Liège ; plundered, massacred, respected not the churches ; their

May 3. altars were stripped ; their pavements ran with blood : a knight dressed himself in the bishop's robes and went through a profane mockery of ordination to some of his freebooting comrades. The bishop was compelled to take an oath of allegiance. He soon fled and pronounced an interdict against the Duke and his lands. The Pope absolved him from his oath.

Otho made a desperate attempt to propitiate the adherents of the house of Swabia. In Nordhausen he Aug. 7. 1212. celebrated with great pomp his nuptials with Beatrice the daughter of the Emperor Philip, to whom he had been long betrothed. This produced only more bitter hatred. Four days after the marriage Beatrice died. The darkest rumors spread abroad : she had been poisoned by the Italian mistresses of Otho.

<sup>1</sup> Ubi octaginta principes ei occurrerunt *multum flenti* et de rege *Franciæ* conquerenti . . . Ubi curiæ archiepiscopi et episcopi pauci interfuerunt, eo quod de mandato domini Papæ eum excommunicatum denunciaverant. — Rem. Leod. apud Martene, v.

Frederick in the mean time, almost without attendants, with nothing which could call itself an army, set off to win the imperial crown in Germany. At Rome he was welcomed by the Pope, the Cardinals, <sup>March, 1212.</sup> and the senate. He received from Pope Innocent counsel, sanction, and some pecuniary aid for his enterprise. Four galleys of Genoa conveyed him with his retinue from Ostia to that city, placed under <sup>May 1 to July 9.</sup> the ban of the Empire by Otho. Milan was faithful to her hatred of the Hohenstaufen; <sup>1</sup> he dared not venture into her territory; the passes of Savoy were closed against him; he stole from friendly Pavia to friendly Cremona. He arrived safe at the foot of the pass of Trent, but the descent into the Tyrol was guarded by Otho's partisans. He turned obliquely, by difficult, almost untrodden passes, and dropped down upon Coire. Throughout his wanderings the Archbishop of Bari was his faithful companion. Arnold, Bishop of Coire, in defiance of the hostile power of Como, which belonged to the league of Milan, welcomed him with loyal hospitality. The warlike Abbot of St. Gall had sworn, on private grounds, deep hatred to Otho: he received Frederick with open arms. At St. Gall he heard that Otho was hastening with his troops to occupy Constance. At the head of the knights, the liegemen of the Abbot of St. Gall, <sup>August.</sup> Frederick made a rapid descent, and reached Constance three hours before the forces of Otho. The wavering Bishop, Conrad of Tegernfeld, declared against the ex-

<sup>1</sup> Compare letter of Innocent rebuking Milan for her attachment to Otho — *reprobo et ingrato, immo Deo et hominibus odioso, qui nunquam nisi mala pro bonis retribuit.* — *Epist. ii. 692.* Oct. 21, 1212. There is a very curious account of the Lombard politics on this occasion in the *Chronicon Placentinum*, p. 37. Piacenza ever sided with Milan.



communicated Otho; Constance closed its gates against him. That rapid movement won Frederick the Empire. At Basle he was welcomed by the Bishop of Strasburg at the head of 1500 knights. All along the Rhine Germany declared for him; he had but to wait the dissolution of Otho's power; it crumbled away of itself. The primate Siegfried of Mentz, secured Mentz and Frankfort; even Leopold the deposed Bishop of Worms, the rival Archbishop of Mentz, the turbulent and faithful partisan of the house of Hohenstaufen, was permitted to resume his See of Worms.<sup>1</sup> Frederick

Dec. 2. was chosen Emperor at Frankfort, and held

Feb. 2. his court at Ratisbon. Otho retired to his patrimonial domains in Saxony; he was still strong in the north of Germany; the south acknowledged Frederick. On the Lower Rhine were some hostilities, but between the rivals for the Empire there was no great battle. The cause of Frederick was won by Philip Augustus of France. Philip had welcomed, and had entered into a close alliance with Frederick.<sup>2</sup> The King of England, the Count of Flanders, and the other Princes of the Lower Rhine arrayed themselves May 27, 1214. in league with Otho. The fatal battle of Bouvines broke almost the last hopes of Otho; he retired again to Brunswick; made one bold incursion, and with the aid of the Bishop Waldemar seized on A.D. 1215. Hamburg. But to his enemies was now added the King of Denmark. Again he retreated to the home of his fathers, passed the last three years of

<sup>1</sup> Leopold had been absolved before Philip's death, Nov. 1207. Epist. Innocent i. 731.

<sup>2</sup> Frederick had an interview with Louis, elder son of Philip, between Vaucouleurs and Tours, Nov. 1212.

life in works of piety and the foundation of religious houses. Long before his death Frederick had July 25. received the royal crown from the hands of May 19, 1217. Siegfried of Mentz at Aix-la-Chapelle. He was now undisputed King and Emperor, in amity with the Church ; amity hereafter to give place to the most obstinate, most fatal strife, which had yet raged between the successor of St. Peter and the successor of the Cæsars.

## CHAPTER IV.

## INNOCENT AND PHILIP AUGUSTUS OF FRANCE.

THE kingdom of France under Philip Augustus almost began to be a monarchy. The crown had risen in strength and independence above the great vassals who had till now rivalled and controlled its authority. The Anglo-Norman dukedom, which, under Henry II., in the extent of its territory and revenues, its forces, its wealth, with his other vast French territories, had been at least equal to that of France, had gradually declined; and Philip Augustus, the most ambitious, unscrupulous, and able man who had wielded the sceptre of France, was continually watching the feuds in the royal family of England, of the sons of Henry against their father, in order to take every advantage, and extend his own dominions. With Philip Augustus Innocent was committed in strife on different grounds than in the conflict for the German empire. The Emperors and the Popes were involved in almost inevitable wars on account of temporal rights claimed and adhered to with obstinate perseverance, and on account of the authority and influence to be exercised by the Emperor over the hierarchy of the realm. The Kings of France were constantly laying themselves open to the aggressions of the Supreme Pontiff by the irregularity of their lives. The Pope with them assumed the high

function of assertor of Christian morals and of the sanctity of the marriage tie, as the champion of injured and pitiable women. To him all questions relating to matrimony belonged as arbiter in the last resort; he only could dissolve the holy sacrament of marriage; the Pope by declaring it indissoluble, claimed a right of enforcing its due observance. Pope Cœlestine had bequeathed to his successor the difficult affair of the marriage of Philip Augustus; an affair which gave to Innocent the power of dictating to that haughty sovereign.

Isabella of Hainault, the first wife of Philip Augustus, the mother of Louis VIII., had died A.D. 1190. before the king's departure for the Holy Dec. 27, 1191. Land. Three years after his return he de- A.D. 1194. termined on a second marriage. Some connection had sprung up between the kingdoms of Denmark and of France. Denmark was supposed to inherit from Canute the Great claims on the crown of England; claims which, however vague and obsolete, might be made use of on occasion to disturb the realm of his hated rival; his rival as possessing so large a part of France, his personal rival throughout the Crusades, Richard of England. Richard was now a prisoner in Germany; if Philip had no actual concern in his imprisonment, he was not inactive in impeding his liberation. Rumor spoke loudly of the gentle manners, the exquisite beauty, especially the long bright hair, of Ingeburga, the sister of the Danish king. Philip sent to demand her in marriage; it was said that he asked as her dowry the rights of Denmark to the throne of England, a fleet and an army to be at his disposal for a year. The prudent Canute of Denmark shrunk from

a war with England, but proud of the royal connection, consented to give the sum of 10,000 marks with his sister. Ingeburga arrived in France, Philip Augustus hastened to meet her at Amiens; that night, it was asserted by the queen but strenuously denied by Philip, he consummated the marriage. The next morning, during the coronation, the king was seen to shudder and turn pale. It was soon known that he had conceived an unconquerable disgust towards his new queen. Every kind of rumor spread abroad. He was supposed to have found some loathsome personal defect, or to have suspected her purity; some spoke of witchcraft, others of diabolic influence.<sup>1</sup> He proposed to send her back at once to Denmark; her attendants refused the disgraceful office of accompanying her shamed and repudiated to her brother. Ingeburga remained in France, or in the neighboring Flanders; while the king sought means for the dissolution of this inauspicious marriage. Some of his courtiers, as might be expected, urged him to indulge his will at all hazards; others, the more sober, to struggle against his aversion. He is said a second time to have entered her chamber;<sup>2</sup> by her account to have exercised the rights of a husband, but this he again denied. Her ignorance of the language, and her awkward manners, strengthened his repugnance. The only means of dissolving the sacrament of marriage was to prove its invalidity. The Church had so extended the prohibited degrees of wedlock that it was not difficult

<sup>1</sup> Gesta, ch. xlviii. suggerente diabolo. Such is the cause assigned by the ecclesiastical writers.

<sup>2</sup> Asserebat autem Regina quod Rex eam carnaliter cognoverat; Rex vero a continuo affirmabat quod ei non potuerat carnaliter commiscere. — Gesta, *ibid.*



by ascending and descending the different lines to bring any two persons of the royal houses within some relationship. A genealogy was soon framed by which Philip and his queen were brought within these degrees.<sup>1</sup> The obsequious clergy of France, with the Archbishop of Rheims at their head, pronounced at once the avoidance of the marriage. The humiliating tidings were brought to Ingeburga; she understood but imperfectly, and could scarcely A.D. 1196. speak a word of French. She cried out — “wicked, wicked France! Rome, Rome!” She refused to return to Denmark: she was shut up in the convent of Beaurepaire, where her profound piety still further awoke compassion, especially among the clergy.<sup>2</sup> Philip Augustus affected to disdain, but used every violent measure to impede, her appeal to Rome.

Philip’s violent passions did not rest in the dissolution of the marriage with Ingeburga; he sought to fill her place. Yet three nobly born maidens refused the hand of the King of France, either doubting the legality of any marriage with him, or disdaining to expose themselves to his capricious rejection; among them was the daughter of Herman of Thuringia, Otho’s most powerful adherent in his conflict for the empire. At length, Agnes, the beautiful daughter

<sup>1</sup> Gesta, *ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> Stephen of Tournay wrote in her behalf to the Cardinal Archbishop of Rheims. His scriptural and classical knowledge is exhausted in finding examples for her wisdom and beauty. “*Pulcra facie, sed pulcrior fide, annis juvencula sed animo cana; pœne dixerim Sarrâ maturior, Rachele gratior, Annâ devotior, Susannâ castior.*” He adds, “*non deformior Helenâ, non abjectior Polyxenâ.*” She never sat, but always stood or knelt in her oratory. “If the Ahasuerus of France would but rightly acquaint himself with her, she would be his Esther.” — *Apud Baluz. Miscell. lib. i. p. 420.*

of Bertholdt, Duke of Meran, a partisan of Philip, hazarded the dangerous step. The passion of Agnes of Meran. Philip for Agnes was as intense as his hatred of Ingeburga: towards her his settled aversion became cruel persecution. She was dragged about from convent to convent, from castle to castle, to compel her to abandon her pertinacious appeal to Rome. Agnes of Meran, by her fascinating manners, no less than by her exquisite beauty, won the hearts of the gallant chivalry of France, as well as of their impetuous King. She rode gracefully, she mingled in all the sports and amusements of the court, even in the chase; the severe clergy were almost softened by her prevailing charms. The King of Denmark pressed the cause of his injured sister before Pope Cœlestine. The Pontiff sent a Legate to France.<sup>1</sup> The King haughtily declared that it was no business of the Pope's. The clergy of France were cold and silent, not inclined to offend their violent sovereign. Cœlestine himself wanted courage to provoke the resentment of a monarch so powerful and so unscrupulous. So stood affairs at the death of Cœlestine. Almost the first act of Innocent after his accession, was a letter to the Bishop of Paris, in which, after enlarging on the sanctity of marriage, he expresses his profound sorrow that his beloved son Philip, whom he intended to honor with the highest privileges, had put away and confined in a cloister

<sup>1</sup> To the same year, probably before the marriage to Agnes, belongs the letter of Ingeburga (apud Baluzium, *Miscell.* iii. 21). In this she asserts that three years before the date she had been married to Philip Augustus; that he had exercised the rights of a husband; that she was now a prisoner in a lonely castle; that the king despised the letters of his holiness, refused to hear the cardinals, and disregarded the admonitions of his prelates and religious men.

his lawful wife, endangering thereby his fame and salvation. The King is to be warned, that if his only son should die, as he cannot have legitimate offspring by her whom he has superinduced, his kingdom would pass to strangers. Innocent attributes to this crime of the King a famine which was affecting Sept. 1198.

France; he expresses his reluctance, at the same time his determination, to take stronger measures in case of the contumacy of the King.<sup>1</sup> How far the Bishop of Paris fulfilled the Pope's commands is unknown. Before the close of the year the Pope sent as his Legate to France, Peter of Capua, Cardinal of St. Maria in Viâ Latâ, afterwards known as the Cardinal of St. Marcellus. The legate's commission contained three special charges, each of which might seem highly becoming the head of Christendom.<sup>2</sup> I. To establish peace between the Kings of France and England. II. To preach a new crusade. III. To compel the King to receive his unjustly discarded wife. Innocent, in his letter to the King, is silent as to the marriage; his tone is peremptory, commanding not persuading peace. If Philip Augustus does not *humbly* submit to the monition of the legate within a prescribed time, the realm, is to be placed under an interdict — an interdict which will suspend all sacred offices, except the baptism of infants, and the absolution of the dying. Any clerk who shall presume to violate the interdict is to be amerced by the loss of his benefices and his order. The hatred of Philip Augustus and of Richard was deep, inveterate,

<sup>1</sup> Epist. 1, ccxlv., to the archbishops, &c., of France to receive the Legate; ccclv. to the King of France. As Christ's Vicegerent the Pope is bound to enforce peace; his argument for peace in Europe is, that war may be more actively carried on in the Holy Land.

<sup>2</sup> Epist i. 4.

and aggravated by the suspicion, if not the certainty on the part of Richard, that his rival of France was not unconcerned in his long imprisonment. But at this juncture peace was convenient to Philip; he accepted the Papal mediation. Richard was more refractory; but even Richard, embarrassed with the payment of his ransom, involved in the doubtful affairs of Flanders, eager for the cause of Otho in Germany, was disposed to bow before the menace of a Papal interdict, or to conciliate the favor of Innocent.<sup>1</sup> A truce was agreed

Peace  
between  
England  
and France.

upon for five years; the Legate was to watch, and visit with spiritual penalties the violation of the truce. The Crusade was preached with some success. The Counts Theobald of Troyes, Louis of Blois, Baldwin of Hainault, the Count of St. Pol, the Bishops of Troyes and of Soissons, and one or two Cistercian abbots obeyed the summons, and took up the Cross.

But to the command to receive again the hated Ingeburga, and to dismiss the beloved Agnes of Meran, Philip Augustus turned a deaf and contemptuous ear. The Cardinal dared not any longer delay to execute the peremptory mandate of the Pope. This mandate, brief and imperious, allowed some discretion as to the time, none as to the manner of enforcing obedience. "If within one month after your communication the King of France does not receive his queen with conjugal affection, and does not treat her with due honor, you shall subject his whole realm to an interdict: an interdict with all its awful consequences." Twice before, for causes relating to marriage, Kings of France had been under the Papal censure; but excom-

<sup>1</sup> Epist. ii. xxiii. *et seq.*

munication smote only the persons of Robert I. and his Queen Bertha ; that against Philip I. and Beltrada laid under interdict any city or place inhabited by the guilty couple.<sup>1</sup> Papal thunders had grown in terror and in power ; they now struck kingdoms. The Legate summoned a council at Dijon. There Dec. 6, 1199. appeared the Archbishops of Rheims, of Lyons, of Besançon, of Vienne, eighteen bishops, with many abbots, and high dignitaries of the Church. Two presumptuous ecclesiastics, who had been sent to cite the King, were turned ignominiously out of doors ; messengers however appeared from the King, protesting in his name against all further proceedings, and appealing to the Pope. The orders to the Legate were express to admit no appeal. On the seventh night of the council was pronounced the interdict with all its appalling circumstances. At midnight, each priest holding a torch, were chanted the Miserere and the prayers for the dead, the last prayers which were to be uttered by the clergy of France during the interdict. The cross on which the Saviour hung was veiled with black crape ; the relics replaced within the tombs ; the host was consumed. The Cardinal in his mourning stole of violet pronounced the territories of the King of France under the ban. All religious offices from that time ceased ; there was no access to heaven by prayer or offering. The sobs of the aged, of the women and children, alone broke the silence. The interdict was pronounced at Dijon ; some short delay was allowed before it was publicly promulgated in the presence of the clergy at Vienne. So for the injustice of the king towards his queen the whole kingdom of France, thousands of im-

<sup>1</sup> Sismondi, iv. 121. See vol. iii. p. 524.



mortal souls were cut off from those means of grace, which if not absolutely necessary (the scanty mercy of the Church allowed the baptism of infants, the extreme unction to the dying), were so powerfully conducive to eternal salvation. An interdict was not like a war, in which the subjects suffer for the iniquities, perhaps the crimes of their kings. These are his acts as a monarch, representing at least in theory the national will. The interdict was for the sin of the man, the private individual sin. For that sin a whole nation at least thought itself in danger of eternal damnation.

“O how horrible, how pitiable a spectacle it was (so writes one who had seen and shuddered at the workings of an interdict) in all our cities! To see the doors of the churches watched, and Christians driven away from them like dogs; all divine offices ceased; the sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord was not offered; no gathering together of the people as wont at the festivals of the saints: the bodies of the dead not admitted to Christian burial, but their stench infected the air, and the loathsome sight of them appalled the living; only extreme unction and baptism were allowed. There was a deep sadness over the whole realm, while the organs and the voices of those who chanted God’s praises were everywhere mute.”<sup>1</sup>

Of the clergy of France, some in servile, or in awe-struck obedience, at once suspended all the offices of the church. The Bishops of Paris (the Archiepiscopate of Sens was vacant), of Senlis, Soissons, Amiens, Arras, the Canons of Sens, being more immediately under royal jurisdiction, ventured on timorous repre-

<sup>1</sup> Radulph. Coggeshal. Chron. Anglic. apud Martene, v.

sentations. "The people were in a state of pious insurrection. They had assembled round the churches, and forced the doors; it was impossible to repress their determination not to be deprived of their services, their tutelary saints, their festivals. The King threatened the clergy with the last extremities." Innocent rejected their frivolous excuses, which betrayed their weak faith; the Church must no longer labor under this grievous scandal; all who had not fulfilled the Papal mandate before Holy Thursday were to answer for it at Rome. But some sense of national independence, some compassion for their people, some fear of the King, induced others to delay at least the full obedience, the Archbishop of Rheims, the Bishops of Laon, Noyon, Auxerre, Beauvais, Boulogne, Chartres, Orleans. The Bishop of Auxerre was the boldest, he aspired through the King to the vacant archbishopric of Sens!<sup>1</sup>

Philip Augustus was not of a spirit to brook these encroachments; and his haughty temper was inflamed by his passion for Agnes of Meran. He broke out into paroxysms of fury. "By the sword joyeuse of Charlemagne" (we recognize the language of the Romances of the Trouvères), "Bishop," so he addressed the Bishop of Paris, "provoke not my wrath. You prelates, provided you eat up your vast revenues, and drink the wines of your vineyards, trouble yourselves little about the poor people. Take care that I do not mar your feasting, and seize your estates."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Gesta, 56.

<sup>2</sup> Gesta, Chronique de St. Denis. Among the most curious illustrations of the age is a poem, written by Giles Corbeil, physician of Philip Augustus, of 5925 hexameter lines. Corbeil was before known by poems on subjects relating to his profession. This new poem has but recently come to light;

He swore that he had rather lose half his dominions than part from Agnes of Meran, who was flesh of his flesh. He expelled many of the ecclesiastics, who dared to obey the Pope, from their benefices, and escheated all their property. The King's officers broke into the palace of the Bishop of Senlis, carried off his horses, habiliments, and plate. Ingeburga was seized, dragged from her cloister, and imprisoned in the strong castle of Etampes.<sup>1</sup> But the people, oppressed by the heavy exactions of Philip Augustus, loved him not; their affections, as well as their religious feelings, were with the clergy. The barons and high vassals threatened;

it was written probably under Honorius III. about 1219, but refers to the times of Innocent. It is a furious satire against the pride, luxury, and irreligiousness of the French hierarchy. The Legate under Innocent, Cardinal Gualo of Vercelli, is not spared:—

“Guttare pomposo tumido Galone relicto,  
Qui Gallicanum, Crasso felicior, aurum  
Sorbuit, argento mensas spoliavit, et omnes  
Divitias rapuit, harpye more rapacis;  
Qui culicem colando volens glutire camelum,  
Imposuit collis onus importabile nostris,  
Tollere cum non posset idem, digitoque movere;  
Qui tantis iterum laqueis moderamine nullo  
Strinxit et aretavit, cætus prohibendo solutos,  
Quod sacra conjugii plerique refragula frangunt  
Per fas atque nefas, sine lege vel ordine currunt,  
Atque vias veteres recolunt, dudumque sepultos  
Enormes renovant antiqui temporis actus:  
Et pejus faciunt, pravusque repullulat error.  
Quæ quamvis prohibenda forent, quia talia prorsus  
Mactat et elidit divini regula juris.  
Ipsa tamen, posito cunctis moderamine rebus,  
Simplicibus verbis, hortatibus atque modestis  
Extirpari debuerant, anathemate dempto.”

In the account of this poem, by M. V. Le Clerc, in the xx. tome of the *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, will be found ample illustrations of this speech of Philip Augustus; on the dress, the table, the habit and manners of the hierarchy. The poem is called “Gera Pigra, Ἰερα πίκρα,” p. 337, *et seq.*

<sup>1</sup> Addition à Chronique de St. Denis.

they actually began to rise up in arms. Innocent might seem to have acted with sagacious policy, and to have taken the wise course to humiliate the King of France. With strange mercy, while he smote the innocent subjects of Philip, the more awful sentence of personal excommunication was still suspended over the King's head and that of Agnes of Meran ; it was reserved for a last, a more crushing blow, but one perhaps which might have led to perilous consequences. He had even (he boasts of his lenity) spared the uncle of the King, the Archbishop of Rheims, who had dared to pronounce the dissolution of the marriage.<sup>1</sup>

Philip, alarmed at the mutinous movements among the people, at length sent certain ecclesiastics and knights to Rome, to complain of the harsh proceedings of the Legate ; to declare himself ready to give sureties that he would abide by the sentence of the Pope. "What sentence?" sternly exclaimed the Pope, "that which has been already delivered, or that which is to be delivered? He knows our decree: let him put away his concubine, receive his lawful wife, reinstate the bishops whom he has expelled, and give them satisfaction for their losses; then we will raise the interdict, receive his sureties, examine into the alleged relationship, and pronounce our decree." The answer went to the heart of Agnes of Meran; it drove the king to fury. "I will turn Mohammedan! Happy Saladin, he has no Pope above him!" But without the support of the princes and prelates of the realm even the haughty Philip Augustus must bow. He summoned a

<sup>1</sup> Nec in personam subintroductæ, vel tuam sententiam aliquam proferendam duxerimus, sed terram tantum post frequentes commonitiones subiecimus interdicto. — Epist. v. 50.

parliament at Paris; it was attended by all the great vassals of the crown. Agnes appeared in her beauty, as when she had distributed the prizes of valor at Compiègne; in her sadness (says a chronicler of the day),<sup>1</sup> like the widow of Hector before the Greeks (she was far gone with child). The barons sat mute, not a sword flashed from its scabbard. "What is to be done?" demanded the King. "Obey the Pope, dismiss Agnes, receive back Ingeburga." So appalled were the nobles of France by the Papal interdict. The King turned bitterly to the Archbishop of Rheims, and demanded whether the Pope had declared his dissolution of the marriage a mockery. The prelate denied it not. "What a fool wert thou, then, to utter such a sentence!" The King sent a new embassy to Rome. Agnes of Meran addressed a touching epistle to the Pope. "She, a stranger, the daughter of a Christian prince, had been married, young and ignorant of the world, to the King, in the face of God and of the Church; she had borne him two children. She cared not for the crown, it was on her husband that she had set her love. Sever me not from him." The inflexible Pope deigned no reply. Innocent sent the Cardinal of Ostia, a kinsman of the King of France, one of his most trusted counsellors, in compliance with the King's suppliant request, as the Legate to France. His instructions were full and explicit: he was to demand complete satisfaction for the dispossessed clergy, the banishment of the concubine ("the German adul-

<sup>1</sup> Gul. Brito. I have consulted Capefigue's *Philippe Auguste*, but with the care with which it is necessary to read that rapid but inexact writer. This, however, was his first and best work. There are some important letters on the subject in *Langebek. Rerum Danicarum Scriptores*.



teress" she is called by some of the coarser writers), not only from the palace but from the realm; the public reception of Ingeburga; an oath and sureties to abide by the sentence of the Church. The Cardinals (Octavian of Ostia was accompanied by John of Colonna) were received in France in a kind of trembling yet undisguised triumph; they came to deliver the land from its curse. At Vezelay they were met by the great prelates and clergy of the realm; the King received them at Sens with the utmost respect; he promised satisfaction to the Churchmen, was reconciled to the Bishops of Paris and Soissons. To the King's castle of St. Leger came the cardinals, the prelates; and in their train Ingeburga. The people thronged round the gates: but the near approach of Ingeburga seemed to rouse again all the King's insuperable aversion.<sup>1</sup> The Cardinals demanded that the scene of reconciliation should be public; the negotiation was almost broken off; the people were in wild despair. At last the King seemed to master himself for a strong effort. With the Legates and some of the churchmen he visited her in her chamber. The workings of his countenance betrayed the struggle within: "The Pope does me violence," he said. "His Holiness requires but justice," answered Ingeburga. She was led forth, presented to the Council in royal apparel; a faithful knight Council at Sens, Sept 7, 1200. of the King came forward, and swore that the King would receive and honor her as Queen of France. At that instant the clanging of the bells proclaimed the raising of the interdict. The curtains were withdrawn from the images, from the crucifixes; the doors of the churches flew open, the multitudes streamed

<sup>1</sup> Epist. iii. 140. Apud du Theil.

in to satiate their pious desires, which had been suppressed for seven months. The news spread throughout France; it reached Dijon in six days, where the edict first proclaimed was abrogated in form. Nothing, however, could induce Philip Augustus to live with Ingeburga as his wife. He severed himself from Agnes of Meran, now a third time about to become a mother. It is said that at their parting interview their passionate kisses, sobs, and mutual protestations were heard. Her pregnancy was so far advanced that she could not leave the kingdom; she retired to a castle in Normandy; the serfs were said to see her pale form wandering, with wild gestures and dishevelled hair, upon the battlements. She brought forth a son in sorrow; he received the fitting name of Tristan.

The Legates appointed a Council for the solemn adjudication of the cause. It was to meet at Soissons at a time fancifully fixed at six months, six days, and six hours from the date of the summons. The King of Denmark and the Archbishop of Lund were cited to the support of the cause of the Danish princess. But in the mean time, with all outward show of honor, Ingeburga was but a more stately prisoner. She complained to the Pope of the favor shown by the Legate to the King: Octavian had been flattered and softened by the recognition of his relationship to Philip. Innocent himself addressed the cardinals in language, which delicately suggested his dissatisfaction. If the Pope was not yet content with his victory over the King, the prelates, and clergy, who had refused instantaneous and complete obedience to the interdict, must be punished with the most abject humiliation. The Archbishop of Rheims, the Bishops of Chartres, of

Orleans, Melun, Noyon, Beauvais, and Auxerre were compelled to appear at Rome (the aged and the infirm were alone permitted to appear by their proctors) to express their contrition and obtain absolution at the feet of the Pontiff. The Pope prohibited the promotion of Hugo, the refractory Bishop of Auxerre, to the Archbishopric of Sens.<sup>1</sup>

The Council of Soissons met at the appointed time in great pomp. The Cardinal Octavian pre-<sup>Council of Soissons.</sup>sided at first, without awaiting the arrival <sup>Mar. 2, 1201.</sup> of the Cardinal of St. Paul. The King entered the city on one side; Ingeburga took up her dwelling in the convent of Notre Dame. She was received with the honors of a Queen. On the side of the King appeared a great number of learned lawyers, who pleaded at considerable length the nullity of the marriage; the Archbishop of Lund and the Danish ambassadors declared that they were present when the messengers of Philip demanded Ingeburga in marriage; having sworn in his name that he would marry her and crown her as soon as she entered his realm. They produced the oath. "We arraign you, King of France! therefore, of perjury, of breach of faith; we appeal from the Lord Octavian, your kinsman, in whom we have no trust, to the Pope." Octavian requested them to await the arrival of the Cardinal of St. Paul. "We have appealed to the Pope," they said, and departed. But on the arrival of the Cardinal John the cause went on. Ten bishops and several abbots pleaded for Ingeburga. But an unknown champion appeared in the lists,<sup>2</sup> and bore

<sup>1</sup> Gesta, lvii.

<sup>2</sup> Roger Hoveden.

away the prize in defence of the injured beauty, Agnes of Meran. He was an ecclesiastic of unpretending demeanor, but such was the perspicuity, the learning, and the fervor of his speech, that the assembly sat in wonder. He disappeared at the end. So ran the legend of this unknown priest, who came to the rescue of the Queen of France. But there seemed no end to the inexhaustible arguments — they had sat fourteen days ; the cardinals, the audience showed signs of impatience : they were strangely and suddenly released. One morning the King rode up to the Council ; he declared that he would receive and live with Ingeburga as his wife. At once she was mounted behind him ; and the King rode off with his hated spouse through the wondering streets, without bidding farewell to the perplexed cardinals. The Council was at an end. The Cardinal John returned to Rome. The Cardinal Octavian remained in France.

The motive of this extraordinary act of Philip Augustus was unknown in his own days. But in all probability he was informed that his beloved Agnes of Meran was, if not actually dying, not likely to live. Some superstitious fears arising from her death, some remorse which might awaken in the hour of affliction, some desire to propitiate the Church towards the object of his love, and to procure availing prayers for her salvation ; above all, that which lay nearest to his heart, and was the object which he pressed most earnestly soon after her death, the legitimation by the Pope of the children which she had borne him, may have determined the impetuous monarch to this sudden change, if not of feeling, of conduct. To the legitimation of his sons the Pope consented. But

whatever his motive, Philip could not, or would not conquer his inconceivable aversion to the person of Ingeburga. To the Pope he declared repeatedly that nothing but witchcraft could be the cause.<sup>1</sup> The Pope, in language somewhat remarkable, urged the King to prepare himself by prayer, by alms, and by the sacrament, in order to dissolve the spell.<sup>2</sup> But in a more dignified letter, he enjoins him at least to treat her with the respect due to the descendant of kings, to the sister of a king, the wife of a king, the daughter of a king. Philip Augustus obeyed not; he eluded even this command. Ingeburga was led from castle to castle, from cloister to cloister; she was even deprived of the offices of religion, her only consolation; her bitter complaints still reached Rome; still new remonstrances were made by Innocent; till her voice seems to have been drowned in the wars of France and England, of Philip Augustus and John; and Innocent in his new function of mediator between or rather dictator to these rival monarchs, seemed to forget the neglected and persecuted Queen. Many years after Philip is said to have made her his Queen in all outward honors, but even then she was not his wife.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See in the *Grande Chronique* what the monks made of this. "Un vieux clerc" (how came he there?) "avait vu le diable tout rouge . . . folâtrant sur les genoux de la reyne, faisant postures et mines horribles."

<sup>2</sup> *Epist.* x. 176.

<sup>3</sup> *Grandes Chroniques*, sub ann. 1213.

END OF VOL. IV.
















COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



0068369042

BRITTLE DO NOT  
PHOTOCOPY

